THE EXPOSITORY TIMES

Notes of Recent Exposition

It is only a few years ago since these Notes referred to Dr. E. F. Scott's arresting study of the Varieties of Religion in the New Testament, a challenging book to a generation accustomed to stress the unity of the New Testament. The same fearless freedom and masterly scholarship is combined with mellow wisdom and warm evangelical feeling in yet another volume of first importance by this venerable teacher, *The Lord's Prayer: Its Character, Purpose and Interpretation.*[1] It is another proof of the vitality, even in a dogmatic age, of Christian Humanism.

One's first impulse is to quote some of the rich sentences which stud the pages like jewels. 'Genuine Christian prayer is always accompanied by an inward glow.' 'We cannot deny the name of Christian to any one who can join, with his whole heart, in the Lord's Prayer.' (Surely a comment on the Œcumenical Movement and on the creeds lurks here.) 'Any clever man, with a little patience and ingenuity, can solve a puzzle; but who will ever explain life or love or duty or faith in God? These are the elementary facts of our being, but they are also its ultimate mysteries.' 'In fellowship with other souls you see your own as in a mirror: you become aware of what is deepest and most real in your human nature.' 'He (Jesus) was never obsessed, as other teachers have been, with the grim fact of death, and there is no mention of it in his prayer.' 'He put himself into his prayer, and what we seek from it is not merely an answer to our petitions but a living fellowship with Christ.'

As for the structure of the prayer Dr. Scott decides emphatically for the originality of the longer version of Matthew. He notes that it has as a background, conscious or unconscious, Hebrew prayers with which Jesus was familiar, and which are obviously echoed in the Lord's Prayer. Its real background, however, is Christ's own teaching; and Matthew recognizes this in including it in the Sermon on the Mount. Dr. Scott shows characteristic frankness in accepting the full implications of Christ's humanity when he writes: 'Particularly when he made his prayer he was anxious to give of his very best,' and 'The prayer has difficulties which were not intended by Jesus. For one thing, the extreme condensation of his thought has made it at some points obscure. His aim was to express great truths with the utmost brevity, but language was not equal to the strain he put upon it.'

Dr. Scott insists that the prayer must be taken as an indivisible whole, and not as a series of petitions; it shows that Jesus was the first to conceive of man's life as a unity rather than as a strange duality of flesh and spirit, or of time and eternity. 'It has often been assumed that the prayer consists of two parts, one of them dealing with man's relation to God and the other with his earthly struggles. But the very aim of Jesus was to wipe out this distinction.'

One outstanding feature in Dr. Scott's study is the way in which he returns again and again to the point that we meet Jesus Himself in His Prayer; and that only thus do we really understand the Prayer. It speaks the mind of Jesus. It is His own guide to the difficulties of His teaching. 'By means of it we touch what was inmost in the Person of Jesus.' 'There is not a word in it which does not recall some act of his or some immortal saying. Not only so, but through his prayer he communicates something of his spirit . . . As we repeat his prayer, we make contact with the Lord.'

This is a noble book to be received with reverence and gratitude. It has weighty, critical authority, and is full of profound devotional teaching. Every minister should feel it his duty to lecture from time to time to his congregation on the Lord's Prayer. If possible he should first go to school with Dr. Scott.

From a minister of the Dutch Reformed Church of South Africa there has come a useful Commentary on the Third Gospel—*Commentary on the Gospel of Luke.*[2] He is the Rev. Norval Geldenhuys, B.A., B.D., Th.M., who received his theological training in Pretoria and Princeton.

[1] Scribners'; 12s. 6d. net.

[2] Marshall, Morgan and Scott; 25s. net.

He is in full sympathy with the Biblical standpoint of the Reformed Church and with that Church's traditional orthodoxy. His Commentary may be described as one by a preacher for preachers. Yet this is not meant to suggest that Mr. GELDENHUYS is in any way lacking in scholarly equipment. His work is not only scholarly but unusually learned; for he can refer to the writings of Dutch commentators as well as those whose works are in German, French, or English.

His method in his Commentary is to quote a section from the English Revised Version of 1881. The exposition that follows is based upon the Greek text as in Nestle's latest edition. Then comes a practical application such as one might expect from a preacher. Then, finally, a series of notes in which the Greek text is often quoted.

A reference to the learned Excursus appearing towards the end of the volume will serve at once to remind us of an important subject of theological discussion and to bring out the standpoint of a recent expositor. The subject is one that has exercised the minds of the expositors of the Gospels since patristic times, but more especially during the last century. It is that of the Day and Date of the Crucifixion. It has been practically agreed that the Crucifixion was on a Friday, but there is no unanimity as to the place of the day in the Jewish chronology of that time.

A. There are solutions of the problem which involve the rejection of the Johannine evidence but the acceptance of the Synoptist. Last century F. C. Baur and the Tübingen School declared even that John *falsely* put the Crucifixion on the day before the Passover Feast, in their desire to throw this Feast into the shade and to represent Jesus as the true Paschal Lamb. This trend of explanation appears more or less fully in writers of the present century like Dalman, Walter Bauer, and even Schlatter.

B. There are also solutions which involve the rejection of the Synoptist evidence but acceptance of the Johannine. In recent times many liberal Biblical expositors take this point of view; among them (to name but one or two) Dibelius, Montefiore, Streeter, Vincent Taylor, Hoskyns, T. W. Manson. They say that the writer of the Fourth Gospel had access to the real facts and of set purpose contradicted the Synoptists, whose data is often ambiguous and even in places self-contradictory. Jesus was crucified on the 14th Nisan and not on the Feast Day, the 15th Nisan; and the Last Supper may not have been a paschal repast, but the weekly 'Qiddush' (purification meal for the Sabbath), or the so-called 'Passover Qiddush,' or a 'Haburoth' meal (a kind of religious community meal).

C. There are also solutions which accept both the Synoptist and the Johannine evidence, regarding the discrepancy between them as only apparent. It may have been Tatian who was the first to realize that there was a problem, but under the influence of Jerome the Synoptic version became the generally accepted view till last century, since when further efforts have been made to harmonize the evidence.

Thus in recent times Strack-Billerbeck held that the Synoptists, following the dating of the Pharisees, are right in saying that Jesus celebrated the Passover according to the Law and was crucified on the 15th Nisan; and that John is right in saying that the Jewish authorities still had to eat the paschal repast on the day of the Crucifixion, following as he does here the dating of the Sadducees.

Mr. GELDENHUYS brings forward objections to this solution and turns to the writers who declare that all four Gospels teach unanimously that Jesus instituted the Lord's Supper or Holy Communion at the actual paschal repast and that He died on the 15th Nisan. Among such writers we may name Edersheim, Zahn, and J. B. Lightfoot. Their arguments are here summarized, and the conclusions affirmed:

1. The Last Supper was indeed the regular Passover meal.
2. The Fourth Gospel by no means contradicts the Synoptic evidence, nor does it suggest a different dating of the day of the Crucifixion, but it presupposes, confirms, and supplements the Synoptic narrative.
3. The first three Gospels in no respect contradict themselves or each other, but unanimously teach that Jesus was crucified on the 15th Nisan, after instituting the Holy Communion on the previous evening (during the Passover meal) as the sign and seal of the New Dispensation.
4. It is not the statements of the Gospels, but a misinterpretation of them and an imperfect acquaintance with and understanding of the circumstances surrounding the Crucifixion, that create the problems concerning the relation between John and the Synoptists and concerning the historical trustworthiness of all four Gospels.

One cannot but admire the erudition Mr. GELDENHUYS displays in this Excursus (not to speak of the erudite background of his Commentary in general), even if one be disinclined to follow him and range oneself in this question on the side of the 'harmonizers.'

The Mind of Christ

V. Whom Jesus Loved

By the Reverend John R. Gray, B.D., Th.M., Glasgow

The very heart of the gospel is the proclamation of the free, undeserved and universal love of God in Christ. 'God so loved the *world*, that he gave his only begotten Son, that *whosoever* believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life' (Jn 3^{16}). Jesus said, 'Come unto me, *all* ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest' (Mt 11^{28}). Nevertheless not once nor twice in the Gospels it is not only implied but clearly stated that Jesus loved individuals or groups of persons in a way different from or in a degree greater than His love towards all. The very fact that His love for some is recorded clearly implies a difference in His attitude to those thus singled out. The individuals so particularized are (1) the Rich Young Man of Mk 10^{21}, (2) the Household at Bethany—Lazarus, Martha and Mary, and (3) the Beloved Disciple in the Fourth Gospel. The groups reserved for some special mention are (4) the Publicans and Sinners, (5) the Immediate Disciples, particularly Peter, James and John, and again in the Fourth Gospel (6) His 'own'—all who had believed in Him.

The Facts

(1) The Rich Young Man of St. Mark's Gospel is in some ways unique. He found the way of discipleship too hard and went away sorrowing. So far as we know he never became one of Christ's followers. The fact, therefore, that the Evangelist records it, that 'Jesus beholding him loved him,' is fairly decisive proof that our Lord was quite specially drawn to the youth.

(2) The evidence for the peculiarly intimate relationship of Jesus with the household at Bethany is to be found in St. Luke's Gospel ($10^{38ff.}$) although St. Matthew (26^{6-13}) and St. Mark (14^{3-9}) probably also refer to Mary. The freedom used by Martha in asking Christ to chide her sister would appear to indicate a degree of familiarity with Him which is confirmed by the fact that Mary seems to have been quite at home sitting at His feet to listen to Him. The other references to Jesus' love of Martha and Mary, references which now include Lazarus their brother, are in the Fourth Gospel. In ch. 11^{3} Lazarus' death is reported to Jesus in the words 'he whom thou lovest is sick.' In that same chapter at $v.^{5}$ it is explicitly stated that 'Jesus loved Martha, and her sister, and Lazarus,' and in $v.^{11}$ Jesus said, 'Our friend Lazarus sleepeth.' The intimate relationship of Jesus to the household is confirmed by the fact that after Lazarus' death when Martha heard of Jesus' coming she immediately went out to meet Him, although still in mourning (11^{20}). It is recorded in $v.^{28f.}$ that He called for Mary who, as soon as she heard that, arose quickly and came to Him. At $v.^{36}$ as He is standing at Lazarus' tomb and weeping, the Jews, evidently commenting on the intensity of a love, well-recognized and accepted, said, 'Behold how he loved him.'

(3) Peculiar to the Fourth Gospel are five texts which speak of 'the disciple whom Jesus loved' (13^{23-25} $19^{26.\ 27}$ 20^{2} 21^{7} and 21^{20}). Attempts have been made to identify this disciple with the writer of the Gospel, with John the son of Zebedee, with the owner of the Upper Room and with an unnamed disciple—not one of the Twelve. The question is not of first importance for our present purpose, so long as it be agreed that there was one disciple for whom Christ had some sort of special feeling. Dr. Garvie in his *The Beloved Disciple* has made a complete examination of the problem and Dr. G. H. C. Macgregor in his *Moffatt New Testament Commentary* on *John* summarizes Dr. Garvie's views and relates them to those of Bacon, Sanday, Stanton, and others. The traditional view identified the disciple whom Jesus loved with John the brother of James who was also credited with writing the Gospel. That can hardly be accepted now. A more reasonable view is that the Beloved Disciple was a citizen of Jerusalem with aristocratic connexions, who saw Christ only when He was in the city and became an open disciple only during the last days of the ministry. It may also be accepted that he was the eye-witness of the closing days of Christ's earthly life on whom the Evangelist largely depended for his first-hand knowledge.

(4) The Gospel according to Christ's enemies tells us of His friendship for publicans and sinners. In Mt 11^{19} and Lk 7^{34} He is described as such. This—and His habit of accepting hospitality from men like Zacchaeus (Lk 19^{5})—raised a problem for the Jews who asked the disciples why their Master ate with publicans and sinners (Mt 9^{11}, Mk 2^{16}, Lk 5^{30}, etc.).

(5) There hardly need be any documentation of the fact that Christ in some special sense made friends of the Twelve. Professor Hunter, in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, lxii. [February, 1951] 151, suggests that the Twelve with Jesus formed a *Chaburah*, 'a company of friends.' To suggest that Jesus chose the Twelve to be officials as it were, is an unthinkable misunderstanding of the doctrine of calling. Worth noting, moreover, is the way in which over and over again Christ chose some out of the disciples to be with Him. Only Peter and James and John saw the raising of Jairus' daughter (Mk 5^{37}, Lk 8^{51}). These three, too, were with Him on the Mount of Transfiguration (Mk 9^{2}, Mt 17^{1}, and Lk 9^{28}). John and Peter were sent to make ready the Passover (Lk 22^{8}), and (if John is identified with the Beloved Disciple) it was he who reclined on Jesus' bosom at the Supper and asked Him about the betrayer (Jn 13^{23-25}). In Gethsemane, Peter, James, and John were again chosen to be with the Master (Mk 14^{33} and Mt 26^{37}). Being known to the High Priest, John secured his own and Peter's admission to the Judgment Hall (Jn 18^{16}). Again, if John was the Beloved Disciple, he stood near the Cross and accepted from his dying Lord the commission to care for Mary, the mother of Jesus (Jn $19^{26.27}$). From all of which it is clear that Peter, James, and John were in some particular sense friends of Christ. The reference to Peter as the rock in Mt 16^{18} is not particularly significant and no account is here taken of the post-Resurrection appearances.

(6) Lastly, the whole tenor of Christ's words recorded in St. John's Gospel from ch. 13 onwards, and particularly in chs. $13^{1.34}$ and 15^{9-15}, suggest that Christ made a clear distinction between the world which He loved and for which He was ready to die and 'his own' who had accepted His calling out of the world (cf. Macgregor, *op. cit.*, 289). Christ states that His followers are His friends if they do what He commands. Dr. Macgregor suggests that no limiting of the love circle is indicated here but only an emphasis on the intimacy of the love. 16^{32} seems to put a clear condition on Christ's love, however, and in the High Priestly prayer in 17^{9} Jesus says, 'I pray for them [*i.e.*, the faithful]; . . . not for the world, but for those whom thou hast given me.' In 17^{19} He proclaims that He is consecrating Himself for their (that is His followers') sake.

THE PROBLEM

From this mass of textual evidence, it seems beyond question not only that some regarded themselves as standing in a specially intimate relationship to Jesus but that He allowed the claim. In view of the wide diversity among the five individuals mentioned — Lazarus and his sisters, the Rich Young Man, the Beloved Disciple, Peter and James and John—and especially in view of the Rich Young Man not being a disciple at all, it is impossible to attempt to establish that they were all specially loved on the ground of being more admirable in character or more devoted in service than others. The Beloved Disciple—if the Jerusalemite aristocrat—had not companied with Christ in the heat of His preaching, healing tours, and we can understand the resentment of Peter implied in Jn 21^{21}. Why should the others be passed over and this late-comer preferred? If the disciple who leaned on Jesus' breast at the Last Supper was John, the problem is hardly less acute. It is impossible to have a special love for one member in a group without at the same time in some sense excluding the others. Any parent, any minister of a congregation will readily recognize this fact and know how easily resentment is aroused at the least suggestion of partiality. Love, of course, knows no question of merit. Like the wind, it bloweth where it listeth, and sometimes from a queer airt. But somehow those who hold by the true divinity of our Lord and even those who regard Him as a sinless man cannot help but expect something other from Him than the haphazard, erratic, partial affections which ordinary men exhibit. It seems to cut at the very foundation of faith to believe that God looks on men with anything but perfect, impartial, total love.

THE SOLUTION?

Christ's preferential love for some raises no problems, of course, for those who utterly reject His divinity. Jesus, a man among men, was kind to nearly all, disliked some people and loved others. (This solution will not commend itself to many readers of this magazine.)

The study of the verbs used does not help towards a solution. ἀγαπάω is used of Christ's love for the Rich Young Man and once of His love for Lazarus and his sisters (Jn 11^{5}). The verb used in other places for His love for Lazarus is φιλέω. φιλέω is also used once to refer to the Beloved Disciple (Jn 20^{2}) but in the other instances it is ἀγαπάω. In Jn 13^{1}, 'having loved his own . . . he loved them unto the end,' ἀγαπάω is used but in 15^{9}, 'As the Father hath loved me, so have I loved you,' it is φιλέω. The latter verb particularly applies to love of the brethren or of a friend and ἀγαπάω is more general. But from their use, it would seem that they were often used interchangeably. Certainly the use of the one or the other can have no significant meaning in the present connexion.

Scholars might, especially as most of the texts

come from the comparatively late Fourth Gospel, suggest that Christ was misunderstood or misreported. This, of course, would not cover the case of the Rich Young Man in St. Mark, and there is evidence in the Synoptics for Christ's enjoyment of the company of the household at Bethany. At any rate the evidence in St. John is pervasive and widespread and is so little to the apologetic point of the Evangelist that it seems odd that he should report such a human trait as Jesus' love for Lazarus. St. John's whole concern was to emphasize the essential divinity of our Lord. It might be maintained that it is a sort of self-glorification on the part of the witness who liked to think that Christ loved him specially, but the tenor of the Gospel is against this view. Surely no one who could write such a Gospel could give a distorted, idealized view of himself.

The friendship of Christ for sinners need not detain us. He has Himself given the explanation in the Parable of the Pharisee and the Publican and in His words (Mt 9^{13}, Mk 2^{17}, Lk 5^{32}) 'I am not come to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance.' Sinners, or those who realized that they were, were open to His call in a way that the self-righteous were not.

The love of Christ for 'his own' is capable of explanation. This love is potentially universal and was meanwhile restricted only by the fact that some would have none of it.

We are, however, left with the plain fact that in some way Peter, James and John, Lazarus, Martha and Mary, the Beloved Disciple (if he was not the disciple John) and the Rich Young Man were in a special way the objects of Christ's affection. To lighten the problem there are two facts that can be adduced: first the fact that our Lord was not in His earthly life omnipresent, and, second, the fact that He was truly human. Since, and that of necessity, Christ was born in a particular place at a particular time and lived His life among a given group of persons, it is obvious that He could only know a given group of men and women. Of some of these He was bound to see more than of others. All those who lived in other countries or at other times are excluded from lying on His bosom no less than those who were witnesses of the privileged one at the Last Supper. On the other hand, we may all in a sense share 'with John His smile of love, with Peter His rebuke.' We can all share a meal with Him no less surely than the household at Bethany.

In the second place if we hold by our Lord's true humanity, if we do not shrink from saying that He was tempted in all points like as we are, that He hungered and thirsted and was weary, why should we feel hesitation in believing that He needed human joys? Why attempt to restrict His true humanity to the shadowed side of life? His evident enjoyment of the beauties of Nature, of the companionship of friends, of feasts, is not only a necessary counter-balance of His sharing of our sorrows, it is a sanctification of our own truest joys. Can a man be truly man who has no friends? Could Christ have been human if He had never been particularly drawn to some one as He was to the Rich Young Man in St. Mark's Gospel? Shall we not—if we love Him—rejoice that as He went the lonely way to Calvary, amidst rebuffs and misunderstandings, there were at least a few who were ready to sympathize and love, who showed at least a glimmering of comprehension?

Can we say anything of the sort of person to whom Christ was particularly drawn? If we think only of Mary, John, the Beloved Disciple (if different from John) and the Rich Young Man, it would seem that we have a fairly homogeneous group. All are thoughtful and contemplative—despite John being one of the Sons of Thunder—gentle—almost refined. Peter, of course, is impetuous—extroverted in the modern cant—and so is Martha. Lazarus is a shadowy figure at the best. It is surprising perhaps that none of them seem to have been poor or particularly simple of heart or mind. Two at least were rich and aristocratic—the Beloved Disciple and the Rich Young Man, and one—John—highly educated if he was in any sense responsible for the Fourth Gospel. But it is probably fallacious to deduce from instances so few anything as to the type of person Jesus loved. We do not love a type at any rate. It is something in the person which calls forth to something in ourselves. Nor would we ourselves dream of producing reasons for our love. It is not good for man to be alone or to be friendly only with members of his own caste or class. To be truly human is to enter into a vast number of personal relationships of every variety of depth and intimacy. And it is part of the richest joy in life to find a few friends who love us and whose love draws out the best that is in us. To hesitate to think of Christ as having close friends is to doubt His real humanity. More, it is to expose our poor conception of friendship; to think of it as a matter of privilege—of a false partiality. If we have learned to ask for nothing from our own friends but friendship we shall rejoice that our Lord was not denied its joys, and we shall rejoice that in Martha and Mary, Lazarus and Peter, James and John—ordinary men and women like ourselves—He found the companionship that He craved. That fact will give us hope that by His grace we too may at the last be brought to enter the charmed circle and talk with Him face to face as a man talks with his friend.

Meantime if we have anything like humility, we

shall be more than content to be even on the edge of the crowd. As Sir Thomas Browne quaintly puts it : ' I believe there shall never be an Anarchy in Heaven, but as there are Hierarchies amongst the Angels, so shall there be degrees of priority amongst the Saints. Yet is it (I protest) beyond my ambition to aspire unto the first ranks ; my desires only are, and I shall be happy therein, to be but the last man, and bring up the Rear in Heaven.'

Literature

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS

Professor E. F. Scott has said that the Epistle to the Hebrews is in many ways ' the riddle of the New Testament.' There it stands among the early Christian writings, solitary and mysterious, ' without father, without mother, and without genealogy,' like that Melchizedek on whom its argument depends. We do not know who wrote it. We do not know when it was written. We do not know to whom it was written, or why the writer penned this ' word of exhortation.' But, of course, we can make what Streeter used to call ' scientific guesses ' at the answers to all these questions ; and some guesses are much nearer the mark than others. It is because the guesses which he makes seem, to the present reviewer, likelier than those made for a long time that he bespeaks the careful attention of students to Professor William Manson's newly published *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (Hodder and Stoughton ; 10s. 6d. net).

Let us summarize his findings. The clue to Hebrews is to be found in Ac 7 and Stephen, who is the true spiritual precursor of *Auctor ad Hebraeos*. The Proto-martyr's dying apostrophe of Jesus as the eschatological ' Son of man ' whom ' all peoples, nations and tongues should serve ' shows that he had glimpsed the more than Messianic significance of Jesus and ' the Way.' In his new eschatology and in his conviction that with Jesus the ancient cultus of Judaism was outmoded lay the seeds of Christianity's world-mission. This is the true key to Hebrews. The Jewish Christians to whom the writer wrote were men of the same spiritual lineage as those who resisted Stephen. They clung nostalgically to the ancient sanctities—the time-honoured Jewish means of grace—and resiled from the challenge and vision of world-mission, of which Stephen had been the pioneer and protagonist. Hence the writer's summons (in his admonitory passages) to ' the eschatological life '—to the new Exodus begun with Jesus which brooked no looking back. Hence also his insistence, in his doctrinal passages, that with Jesus the eternal order of God has finally begun to enter time and to move on to its great consummation. Hence, lastly, his argument that in the new approach to God opened up by Jesus, our Forerunner, the old means of grace are not lost but spiritualized and perfected.

To whom then did *Auctor* write this noble appeal ? To some disaffected ' Hebrew ' Christians in Rome who, fearing the Imperial persecution, shrank back under the protection of the synagogue as a *religio licita*. To these he threw down the challenge : ' Go forth unto Jesus outside the camp (of Israel) (He 13^{13}).' In fine, Hebrews is not the *gnosis* of an Alexandrianizing theologian, but an evangelist's summons to a world-mission Christianity. And what of the date ? The true clues are in He 10^{32-34} which refers to the Claudian edict imposing extradition on the Jews of Rome in A.D. 49, and in He 12^{4}, ' Ye have not yet resisted unto blood.' We must place the letter before the Neronian blood-bath, say, about A.D. 60.

Enough has been said to suggest the originality of Professor Manson's new approach to the Epistle and its problems. I am myself not wholly convinced by all his theses—for example, his claim that the Church in Rome was predominantly Jewish—but his main argument seems to me sound and impressive. Here is new and long-looked-for light on an old problem. If Professor Manson has made out his case, as I think he has, then he has set Christian doctrine, at certain important points, more squarely on the foundation of Christian history, and shown it ' rising phoenix-like from the embers not only of Jewish legalism but of the Jewish means of grace.'

A. M. Hunter

A VOLUME OF ESSAYS

Morals and Revelation (Allen and Unwin ; 16s. net) is the title which Professor H. D. Lewis, of the Chair of Philosophy at University College, Bangor, has given to a volume of collected essays. They have already appeared in such publications as Philosophy, Mind, and the Hibbert Journal. They are on various subjects, and each paper is self-contained and was written in the first instance

for a particular audience; but there is a certain underlying unity of theme. The author's intention in bringing the essays together in their present form has been to amplify some of the views he expressed in his 'Morals and the New Theology' [1947], a book which created some stir among theologians by reason of its charge and complaint that the neo-conservative theology, as represented by Barth, Brunner, and Niebuhr, with its emphasis on collective guilt and responsibility and entanglement with the traditionalist doctrine of the Fall, is effecting an unfortunate and distressing estrangement of religion from morality (cf. THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, lviii. [1947] 310–312).

It is a charge and complaint which theologians must take seriously, especially as coming from an able thinker who possesses a sympathetic understanding of religion. He recurs to it in the first two papers of this volume ('Morality and Religion,' 'Revelation and Reason—a Study of Emil Brunner'). In the succeeding papers also he touches upon it now and then, as in those on 'Collective Responsibility' and 'Moral Freedom in Recent Ethics,' in which he affirms again his own individualist standpoint. It is because he is willing to call himself an individualist, and yet reacts from any kind of Pelagian optimism, that he is looking for a new synthesis of morality and religion such as shall combine our moral insights with the stark reality of sin. Against such a new synthesis the 'new theology' has, as he holds, been setting up a barrier.

We shall not discuss in detail the contents of a volume of collected papers (ten in number) which have been already published. But our readers' attention might well be called to the titles of the last three, which are papers that pass beyond purely ethical issues: 'Some Ambiguities of Mystical Thought,' 'Revelation and Art,' 'On Poetic Truth.' The promised ampler presentation of the last-named essay should be very welcome to many who are interested in the subject of truth and imagination in art and religion.

W. FULTON

RELIGION AND THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

Dr. J. V. Langmead Casserley is a teacher of sociology and also a Christian philosopher and theologian. He is therefore aware of the possibilities and the limits of sociology, and is peculiarly equipped to handle the tension which is apt to arise between religion and the social sciences owing to the fact that they approach man from different points of view. In his latest book, *Morals and Man in the Social Sciences* (Longmans; 12s. 6d. net), he discusses particularly the two points where the tension is most acute—the interpretation of ethics and the evaluation of man. The social sciences rest on the assumption that man and human behaviour are proper objects of scientific investigation, and the varieties of ethical behaviour lie clearly within the field of the sociologist. But is that all that need be said? Does the success of the social sciences mean that man is merely an object of scientific study and ethics totally infected with relativity?

Dr. Langmead Casserley shows good reason for a negative answer; and, in process of doing so, he shows that there is a measure of truth both in naturalism and relativism. This is important, for it means that man is partially immersed in Nature, and it rules out of court any too absolute ethical theory and any too self-assured humanism. The conclusion drawn is that a realistic Christian humanism — conceding all that is valid in naturalism and relativism—has less to fear from the social sciences than have the more absolute systems of secular ethics and non-religious humanism which sometimes claim to have rendered Christianity obsolete.

This, however, is only the main line of discussion. There are others, too, conducted with knowledge and insight. This is a book inexpensive as prices go nowadays, and readable by, and of apologetic worth to, the ordinary educated Christian as well as the professional sociologist and theologian. The first part of it is based on a course of lectures which the author gave two years ago at the Ecumenical Institute near Geneva.

While we commend Dr. Langmead Casserley's own writing, it may be in place to add that he is the editor of a new quarterly—*The New Outlook for Faith and Society* [No. 1, Spring 1951 (Mowbray; 3s.)]. When so many good journals are dying, it is a pleasure to welcome the birth of another. Dr. Langmead Casserley makes a good beginning, and promises contributions in forthcoming issues from scholars like Dr. Demant. We trust that by the end of the first year he may have more than the fifteen hundred faithful subscribers which he needs to guarantee the future of his venture.

STEWART MECHIE

THE GOSPEL OF GOD

When Dr. Anders Nygren of Sweden was appointed Bishop of Lund he sent out a pastoral letter to his diocese. This letter, translated by L. J. Trinterud, has now been published under the title *The Gospel of God* (S.C.M.; 6s. net). Dr. Nygren, who was for many years Professor of Theology and Ethics at the University of Lund,

holds a distinguished place in the theological and ecclesiastical world of to-day. To many in this country he is perhaps best known through his remarkable book 'Agape and Eros,' a study of the Christian doctrine of love. We may be sure that far beyond the borders of his own land Dr. Nygren's pastoral letter will command interest and appreciation. In the concern of its gracious and ranging reflections bishop and theologian come together for the welfare of the ministry. The first three chapters speak of the gospel of which the minister is the 'herald.' It blesses us with God's peace, and this it does because in Christ the Divine Love became a conquering activity on our behalf and ever more personalizes itself for us as the way to righteousness and life. This central theme leads out, in the five following chapters, to consideration of the gospel in various concrete relationships: the relations thereof to the tasks of preaching and teaching, to the Sacraments, to the unity of the Church, and to the 'Churches' as they stand confronted by the needs of the world. The letter is a virile document, crisp and forthright in style, and into its compass of a hundred and four pages there is compressed a rich store of thought and counsel. It speaks directly to the ministers and does so with evangelical fervour. We may note in this connexion that Dr. Nygren gives one chapter to a masterly theological explication of the invaluable aid for preaching to be found in the Christian year. When Dr. Nygren speaks of the Church he declares that only in a vision of the gospel as the Divine Activity winning our freedom can it ever find its true unity. And as it finds this, so the more adequately will the Church understand the world's need of the salvation of God, and be liberated to go forth to minister it. In the theological pattern of the letter we find what has become of late a characteristic emphasis in Swedish thought, the idea of Christ's work as conflict with and victory over the hostile powers. It is the '*Christus Victor*' theme of Dr. Aulen, and Dr. Nygren renews it here. There will be readers of the pastoral letter who will feel difficulty here. They will feel that the military language itself calls for more precise elucidation, and that apart from this it is not directly serviceable in the theological statement. But this difficulty will not prevent them from sharing with Dr. Nygren in the joyful belief that the life and work of Christ is the Love of God alive for us and ever more given for our highest need. The final word in this notice of a strong and cordial book should be one of praise for the service of the translator, and for the very attractive format given to the book by the publishers.

JOHN MACLEOD

APOLOGETICS FOR ADOLESCENTS

In spite of what is said by the General Editor of the 'Gateway Handbooks' in his Introduction quite a number of books like Professor Laurence E. Browne's *Where Science and Religion Meet* (Religious Education Press; 6s. net) have been published recently, and it might be said that there is general agreement as to how to lead adolescents to approach the problem of the relation and possible conflict of science and religion. One practical judgment on such a book might just be on its likelihood to command the interest and deepen the insight of those to be instructed. The lay-out will depend on whether it is meant for the young person's own reading, or as a lesson help for teachers not very strong on the subject, or as a treatment that a teacher already equipped to deal with the matter might find suggestive.

Teachers who have to give lessons on the right way of reading the Genesis account of Creation, or on the great non-Christian religions, will find Dr. Browne's excellent pages on these themes most useful. His best chapters are perhaps those giving an admirable review of what is meant by the course of evolution in geological epochs and in the emergence of the human race and the growth of its culture.

These chapters form the background of an attempt to use Natural Science and especially the idea of evolution in an apologetic for Christian doctrine; and here the theological critic will feel that the author over-estimates the cogency of his thought and that it is not in line with recent religious thinking to find in evolution the ultimate clue to the difficulties in theology.

Light, he holds, is thrown on the mystery of pain by the considerations that moral is worse than physical evil, that pain has its uses as stimulus and warning, and that it may be inflicted wisely for a good purpose, as by a surgeon. While this is true enough everyone who thinks he has a contribution to make to this problem should ponder the word of Jesus about the woman 'whom Satan hath bound, lo, these eighteen years.' Her calamity, that is to say, was the very devil. It moved Jesus not to moralizing or theorizing but simply to action.

A similar inadequacy besets the use of the idea of moral progress as a clue to the problem of sin. He does not seem sufficiently serious when he describes the work of the Suffering Servant who, Isaiah says, 'was wounded for our transgressions,' as bringing men to the knowledge of God. And one doubts if the fact of mutations in Nature is of real help in connexion with the doctrine of the Incarnation; or if redemption can be expressed in terms of development. And one is not happy

Apollos and the Logos Doctrine

By Emeritus Professor R. L. Archer, M.A., D.Litt., U.C.N.W., Bangor

Christology, or rather the form in which it is stated, is usually agreed to have developed from the shape in which it appears in the Synoptic Gospels, through its enunciation by St. Paul, to its culmination in the Johannine Logos theology. My purpose in this article is to suggest a likelihood that an intermediate link is to be found in Apollos.

Of all the leaders of the Church in Apostolic times Apollos is undoubtedly the greatest to whom the title of Apostle is not ordinarily given. That there was something which appeared distinctive in his theology is shown by the existence of a party at Corinth which called themselves followers of Apollos alongside of the parties which claimed St. Paul and St. Peter as their chiefs. What this was is suggested neither in Acts nor in the Pauline Epistles. He has received increasing recognition in recent times, and Dr. Manson has put forward arguments which seem to me convincing in favour of the view, which is as old as Luther, that he was the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews. It is generally agreed that he was an Alexandrine, that he was saturated with Jewish views which prevailed in Alexandria, and that he was influential in Ephesus as well as in Corinth. Thus he is a man whom we must recognize as quite likely to have left his mark on the Early Church in some way or other. It is now necessary to consider the pointers to the way he did so.

If he is a link between St. Paul and the Evangelist John, we must attack the problem, as it were, at each end—the development in St. Paul and the antecedents of the Evangelist John.

It has long been recognized that the language in which St. Paul expresses his Christology in Colossians, and in which it is expressed in Ephesians, whether that Epistle is actually St. Paul's or not (since it is only a more literary restatement of that in Colossians) is different from that of the earlier Epistles, so much so that at one time German critics denied the Pauline authorship of any Epistle later than Romans. English scholarship has shown that now and again in the earlier Epistles we have remarks which show that St. Paul had always held the doctrine of the pre-existence and unique sonship of Christ, which this German school denied, but that does not alter the difference in stress. The problem still remains—how the difference which cannot fail to be recognized was brought about. In the early Epistles the stress is on the Passion, the Resurrection, and the Second Coming, and on the reactions of converts thereto; the eternal pre-existence and the mystery of the Incarnation are less stressed. No one would contend that the Apostles' and the Nicene Creeds were opposed to one another; but they represent almost exactly the difference between the earlier and the later interest of St. Paul.

Such a change can originate in one of three ways —by internal development, by change of outward conditions, or by the influence of some person or persons. Internal development may be ruled out, as there is no expansion or alteration of the former teaching on the Atonement, the Resurrection, or the Second Coming. It is usual, therefore, to explain the new outlook by change of circumstances only, the change being in the nature of the heretical views which he had to combat. Undoubtedly this change was an essential part of the conditions which produced the new outlook; but, after we have considered these new heresies, we will return to the argument that a personal influence also entered.

Paul found many false beliefs, as well as many moral faults, to censure in his converts—the difficulties felt by educated pagans regarding the Resurrection and the Second Coming, and the antinomianism which some converts regarded as a corollary of the doctrine of justification by faith—but the one persistent and universal opposition came from orthodox Judaism and Judaistic Christianity. Jews and Jewish Christians were everywhere. But there now appears in Asia a religion disseminated by Jews but entirely rejected by the whole of orthodox Judaism, whether of Pharisees or of Sadducees, which became the parent of Gnosticism. It may be called Magian. The more orthodox forms of Zoroastrianism, the earliest monotheistic religion to influence a large empire, had virtually created Pharisaism, with its belief in a future life of rewards and punishments and a devil fighting against the good God, and in angels, including the seven archangels. There the Persian influence ceased. But later a degenerate form of Zoroastrianism with the pre-Zoroastrian Magi as its priests began to influence the East. A number of attributes of the Godhead became personified

as separate beings, Divine, but emanations of the supreme God; and Persian religious ideas mixed with Babylonian, where religion had become virtually astronomical and meteorological, and the Sun, Moon, and planets became identified with Magian objects of worship, and astrology became recognized as at once true science and true religion. Orthodox Judaism got so far as the seven angels, and even placed them in the heavenly bodies (the Apocalypse speaks of the angel who dwells in the Sun) but never worshipped them and largely kept aloof from astrology (though the story of the Magi in St. Matthew recognizes it). But the West regarded astrology and necromancy as specially connected with the Jews, and it is at Ephesus that the great burning of magical books is recounted in Acts.

Two possible Christian reactions were possible to Magian views. One was a total denial of the existence of all Divine emanations and of all the beings claimed to be such. The other was to acknowledge the existence of such beings but to declare them not Divine but demonic. Somewhat unexpectedly to us moderns, Paul adopted the second view. The heavens of the astronomer and meteorologist are ruled by the powers of 'spiritual wickedness in high places,' who are under the control of 'the prince of the power of the air,' and to these powers the Crucifixion was due, and an important purpose of the Crucifixion was somehow to destroy the power of these beings. The only trace of this view or something like it to be found in any other New Testament writer is in Revelation, where the devil is represented as still in heaven, which must surely be the astronomical heaven, as it is difficult to conceive any view by which not only he, but his army, could be in the Divine heaven, whence, as a prelude to the end, he and his host will be cast down by Michael and his angels; for it is to be noted that this event is distinctly stated as future, not, as in Milton and Christian tradition generally, as past.

But another view was possible, to seize on the idea of a Divine emanation, but to declare that Christ alone was such. Such is the doctrine of the Logos, taken over at Alexandria from Stoic thought but made Jewish by the use of the 'word of the Lord' in the Old Testament, and by the reverential use of the phrase by Jews after the pronouncement of the sacred name had become irreverent. Though 'Logos' no less than the Persian terms was little more than a personification of a quality, it appealed alike to Greek philosopher, to Jew, and to Magian as an expression of what Christianity had always called the Sonship of Christ and of what it had always regarded as His revealing and reconciling character to man. It is noteworthy that the term appears in no creed, but we do find in the Nicene Creed the words 'the only begotten Son of God,' and it is not unreasonable to assume that, just as the words 'creator of heaven and earth' are a relic of the days when Cerinthus declared the Creation to be the work of a demiurge and not of the Great God, so these words are a relic of a time when Christianity had to fight a belief in a number of Divine emanations. Similarly St. Paul never took over the term 'Logos,' but he did come to emphasize all which subsequently appeared in the Nicene Creed as regards the relation of the Son to the Father. In fact, if in the opening of the Fourth Gospel we substitute 'the Son' for 'the Logos,' there is nothing in that opening which is not in Colossians and Ephesians.

It is now necessary to consider whether this new emphasis in St. Paul's teaching implies the influence of some other person or whether it was a reaction of his own. The answer cannot be certain; but it is clear that it was an unnecessary reaction in St. Paul's case. He had his own answer, that these astronomical beings were devils, just as the Olympian gods were in his view, and that was enough. The other attitude could only appear an answer to a mind somewhat detached from polemic, apt to look for the truth which gave rise to any error, and philosophical in its working. We can almost call it the academic mind as opposed to that of the man of action. St. Paul's mind was the exact reverse. He was a natural extremist, whether as a Pharisee or as an upholder of Gentile claims or as an opponent of other religions. They were not partial truths or struggles toward the light; they were the work of devils. Apollos was to Paul somewhat as Melancthon was to Luther. Dr. Manson believes that Apollos actually wrote Hebrews to the Colossians and that St. Paul followed in his steps. Even if we do not accept this hypothesis, Apollos at Ephesus could not fail to come into knowledge of the Magian views and Paul could hardly fail to know Apollos's views.

Let us now pass to what I have called the other end, the Johannine teaching of the Logos. It is notable that the term is distinctively Asian; in spite of the great value attached in post-Apostolic times to the Fourth Gospel it was never included in the Creeds. But it is not peculiar to the Evangelist; it appears once in the Apocalypse, also an Asian book, which no modern critic who can be taken seriously regards as the work of the Evangelist (Rev 19^{13}). Moreover, in this passage the term is used as a title without any reference to its doctrinal significance, as if the writer and his readers were perfectly familiar with it but as if, beyond a title, it meant nothing.

his implies that it was already in common use long efore the Johannine Gospel and three Epistles ere written, even if we assign the Apocalypse to e principate of Domitian. Personally, I believe e Apocalypse to be earlier, in the principate of espasian, on the strength of 17^{10}, where five nperors are described as past, one as present, and e as future, before the appearance of the revived ero. It is true that Domitian could be regarded a revivication of Nero, but not as a Nero who vaded the empire along with the Parthians id sacked Rome before turning his attention persecuting the Christians. The Apocalypse, spite of general belief, has a very distinct ot, and the Apocalypse without the beast whose umber is 666 would be undoubtedly a Hamlet ithout the Prince of Denmark; and the above a statement of his part in the plot. If, then, ie term Logos was well known in Asia in the time Vespasian, it must have been introduced in ie time of Nero, and John the Evangelist can ave had nothing to do with its introduction. ut it is recognized as Alexandrine and Philonic; id in Apollos we have an Alexandrine who taught r a long time in Asia. To introduce and secure ie general acceptance of such a term implies a an above the ordinary, and, since it was not troduced either by Paul or by John the vangelist, we know of no other save Apollos. nd neither Paul nor the Evangelist had any nown connexion with Alexandria.

It may be well to meet a few objections.

As regards Apollos, it may be objected that he as not a Christian till he came to Asia, where he as converted by Aquila and Priscilla. This only roves that he did not identify the Logos with esus till he came to Asia; but as a Jew he may ell have been acquainted with the Philonic ews, just as he was already an adherent of the llowers of John the Baptist before he embraced hristianity.

As regards Paul, it may be said that he knew pollos before he wrote any of his letters to the orinthians, and likewise the Corinthians knew pollos; why does not Apollos's influence come ut in any of these letters (or in Romans either), ut waits till a later period when Colossians as written? The answer is that the series of tters from Paul to Corinth dealt entirely with rticular circumstances in the Church at Corinth, rtly moral and partly doctrinal. His aim was keep the Corinthians fast in the doctrine which had taught them, and the usual divagation as to Judaic Christianity, though Greek philosophy was also dangerous, and each section deals with something particular. Romans is quite different, it is St. Paul's only 'Epistle' which is less a letter than a manifesto. None the less it is meant to deal with specific attacks; it is in almost equal measure a defence of Christianity against reasoned attacks and a defence of himself and his specific theology. It therefore has to deal with the argument that Christianity was a Jewish sect but all orthodox Jewish theologians rejected it, that it was disloyal and that it was antinomian: these are the arguments of educated Westerners. On the personal side he has to defend justification by faith against the judaizing party and to show that it did not lead to disrespect for moral law, but only to ceremonial requirements. The stress that is laid on the superior ethical standard of Christians is what we should expect of a manifesto addressed to the practical Romans. We need not be surprised at finding it totally different from an appeal to persons infected with the new magical religions of the East.

To sum up the argument. The doctrine of the Logos was Alexandrian, Philonic and a Jewish interpretation of Stoicism. It is found in the province of Asia only. It entered in the principate of Nero, too early to have been brought by John the Evangelist. Some one has to be found as its introducer. Apollos fills all the conditions. He was an Alexandrian, his main work was at Ephesus, he was a man of outstanding influence, and he had some special theology of his own. When once he is acknowledged as the preacher of the Logos, we must attribute to him the theology of the first chapter of John. It then becomes natural to ask whether he may not explain the existence of that theology without the use of the actual term 'Logos,' which we find beginning to appear in St. Paul's Epistle to the Colossians. A change of emphasis has always been recognized in St. Paul, so much so that it was formerly argued that he could not be the author of any Epistle after Romans. Paul and Apollos must have met often at Ephesus. According to one modern view they both attempted to meet the Magian views among the Colossians. Paul's own reaction to Magian views was quite different. Hence it is not improbable that he was unconsciously influenced by Apollos, in which case Apollos solves two problems, the origin of the Christian 'Logos' doctrine and the change in St. Paul's emphasis which has long puzzled Pauline scholars.

In the Study

Virginibus Puerisque

The Heart of the Festival

By the Reverend William Bryce, M.A., B.D., Sunderland

'Love the brotherhood. Fear God. Honour the king.'—1 P 2^{17}.

I hope you will pay a visit to the Festival of Britain. It is well worth a visit. I would like every school-child in this country to see it. I confess I went to it prepared to be bored. Exhibitions can be heavy on the mind and sore on the feet! But I was agreeably surprised. I found it all so interesting, so exciting, that I forgot to feel tired.

If and when you see it, I am sure you will agree with me that the centre and heart of the Festival is the Pavilion that bears the name of The Lion and the Unicorn. Three things there capture one's attention at once.

First of all, there is a cluster of flags of our Empire, and above them a huge crown. The monarchy has a firm place in our constitution, and retains its hold on the hearts and affections of our people. King George and Queen Elizabeth are greatly beloved throughout the length and breadth of our land and Empire. It is up to us to honour the King.

On one side of this cluster of flags there is a representation of justice. This consists of the scarlet robes of a judge, surmounted with a white wig; the sword of justice and the scales of justice; and a facsimile of Magna Carta and the Habeas Corpus Act. These are the basis of the freedom we enjoy here in Britain, freedom to live our lives in peace and security. Each of us has his or her rights, and they must be respected. These rights are our birth-right as British citizens.

On the other side stands a huge white cross. It reminds us that our Empire has been built on sacrifice, the sacrifice of those—a great multitude of the brave and the good and the true—who loved not their lives unto the death, our fellow-countrymen who in two World Wars were a wall unto us by day and by night, who gave the most that any one can give, life itself, for King and country. Yes, and this cross reminds us of Jesus Christ, our Lord and Saviour, who loved us and gave Himself for us.

That is how it struck me, that Pavilion No. 18 is the very heart of the Festival.

St. Paul has summed up the meaning and message of it all in memorable words—'Honour all men. Love the brotherhood. Fear God. Honour the king.'

I'll Send a Pigeon

By the Reverend Charles M. Hepburn, B.D., Crieff

'Also he sent forth a dove from him.'—Gn 8^{8}.

In a newspaper recently a heading of the 'stop, look and listen' variety stopped me, made me pick up the paper and read. Here is what it said:

MR. STRACHAN'S
MESSAGE BOYS
ACTUALLY FLY.

Not many message boys are as speedy as that, are they? I heard of some, however, who, I should say, nearly fly. A few weeks ago a friend, writing to me from Germany, described a great modern factory there. It has all sorts of ideas for speeding things up, like lifts that are always running and, here was what struck me most, 'messengers on roller skates.' About the nearest thing to flying, I should think.

But what about Mr. Strachan's message boys? Mr. Strachan, it seems, started a store at Braemar a short time ago. A new customer walked in.

'Two jelly bags, please!' she said.

The assistant shook his head.

'Sorry, Madam, no jelly bags, but I'll send a pigeon for them.'

Out hurried the customer thinking the poor man was wrong in the head. Just as he said, however, the jelly bags arrived a little later, not that any one saw a pigeon towing them through the air. No, here is what happened. A pigeon was sent from the store at Braemar to the main shop at Aboyne, about thirty miles away, with the order for the jelly bags tucked into a little metal cylinder tied to its leg, and, after the message arrived, back came the jelly bags by motor van. A wise man, Mr. Strachan, to make that use of his homing pigeons.

It is such a marvellous and mysterious power, isn't it, that of these pigeons, how they find their way home. A man who breeds these birds told an astonishing story of one. A homer pigeon that was taking part in a competition was caught on its way home and had its wings clipped. It was kept captive for two or three years, by

bout Dr. Browne's way of putting it that hristians are aware of God and Christ and the oly Spirit separately, or about attributing to e lack of knowledge of evolution past failures explain how 'Christ could be simultaneously od and man.'

While these theological inadequacies detract om the value of the book its high quality is seen the way it touches on two very arresting specu-tions. One is that the time factor involved in fe not only in its physiological processes but the mental awareness of time even in sleep, may nk with a property of matter itself seen in the te of disintegration of radium and in the process some chemical reactions such as hydrolysis. he other is the suggestion that an enormous astage is perhaps the necessary background r a sense of value.

R. W. Stewart

A SHORTER BIBLE

The Shorter Oxford Bible, abridged and edited y Canon G. W. Briggs, Professor G. B. Caird, nd Principal N. Micklem (Oxford University ress; 7s. 6d.; school edition, 6s.), is a quite xcellent production. In an extremely interesting reface the editors set forth the principles on hich they have worked. They have no desire present the Bible as literature; they wish to resent it as the Word of God. They draw a ost useful distinction between the Word and the ords. 'The words are the words of men ex-ressing at the stage of their development, the Vord of God speaking to them.' Because of is they have proceeded on three definite prin-ples. First, the Bible is the record of the people f God, which is the same thing as to say that it the record of the Church. Second, the Bible the record of the acts of God. 'It is not so much he search of man as the revelation of God to an.' From the first the watchword is not 'wise en think,' but 'God hath spoken.' It is for that eason that the editors take the unusual and the ery wise step of grouping their selections not much in chronological order as round the great pects of the Christian faith. Third, they pay ecial attention to the intertestamental period, hereby making New Testament history much ore intelligible and also thereby providing the portunity to study the development of such a reat idea as immortality. One of the most -ful sections is the section in which the Gospel aterial is woven together from all sources to rm a consecutive narrative. There are also ost convenient sections on the Teaching of Jesus, e Christian Way of Life in the Apostolic Letters, d the Christian Faith in the Apostolic Letters set out under the various affirmations of the Creed. The book closes with suggested syllabuses for reading from the Primary Stage up to the Fifth Year. Each section of the book opens with a brief but adequate introduction. There can be no doubt that this is by far the best Shorter Bible which has yet appeared. It will be equally useful for schools and for purposes of private reading and study.

William Barclay

The point of view in *Christian Love* by Dr. Paul E. Johnson (Abingdon-Cokesbury; $3.00) is psychological, but it is psychology broadly conceived, including a deliberate study of social and religious behaviour. Christian love is appreciative to a greater degree than other forms of love of the meaning of community. It finds security over against its opposites in the belief in a Heavenly Father, gathering all men into one family, but it does not regard even the Divine love as absorbing or as denying the specific value of the person or persons towards whom it is directed. It is interested in and appreciative of others, but its root characteristic is a desire for response. Because of its over-emphasis upon receptivity or pure giving the author criticizes adversely Nygren's conception of *agape*, and holds that man is called upon to give a response to the Divine love and thus become 'responsible.' Christian love does not, he says, 'mean sending best wishes with no return address.'

Christian love always implies a creative relationship, and in this connexion we are given a convincing argument, not without a touch of humour, about the desirability of applying democratic principles within the family. A penetrating analysis is given of the influences opposed to love within the family and also in the wider community and the international sphere. Realism is shown in the recognition of original anti-social impulses, but there is optimism also in the belief that 'aggression' may be sublimated into love and service. Correspondingly, the author introduces a useful distinction between self-love and selfishness, and shows that much of the negation in Eastern philosophy and asceticism is due to a confusion between the two.

The book closes on a hopeful note. Although it is not sanguine about the success of broad-based measures for the abolition of war, and holds that 'we cannot save the world from war without saving man from war,' it finds much evidence even within this modern warring world of the growth of unselfish love and service. Much is expected from the Christian Church if only it will cease from sectarian hostility and awaken its members from indifference. The author does

not desire that the influence of the Church should be either inclusive or exclusive, dominating or withdrawing into its own sanctity. His ideal is that it should be 'contagiously Christian,' and he closes with a beautifully worded appeal for the expansion of our Christian love to the larger family of the whole earth.

No contemporary interpreter of Judaism to Christianity is more persuasive than Rabbi Ignaz Maybaum. His latest book is *The Jewish Mission* (James Clarke; 10s. 6d. net). The situation which faced Judaism at the end of the War was as tragic as any in its long history. Between 1933 and 1945 six and a half million Jews were murdered. Dr. Maybaum compares this third Churban (destruction) with those which took place in 586 B.C. and A.D. 70, when the temples were destroyed. No one with any human feeling can do other than grieve with the survivors of such a catastrophe. Where does the Jew stand now and whither should he go?

When Dr. Maybaum wrote 'The Jewish Home' he was descriptive and easy to follow. The style of the present work is emotional—quite understandably so—rather than logical, and the explanatory 'Notes for the Christian Reader' are hardly adequate for those who bring to the subject no other qualification than a willingness to understand. There is, if we understand him aright, a strong element of 'quietism' in Dr. Maybaum's attitude and outlook. Almost the final paragraph in the book reads: 'Liberalism and Zionism involved us completely in the current affairs of world history. But the best we can give to the world can be given only when we are Jews. It is for the sake of mankind that we must also be able to ignore the world around ourselves. Resting in our innermost self, which is neither a racial nor a national individuality, neither a political nor a cultural characteristic, but the miraculous penetration of God's shaping master hand into our human existence, we are Jews. Looking into the soul of the Jew, pondering over his history and literature, we will discover God.' With the best will in the world we cannot help asking, 'What, precisely, does it mean?'

O'er Every Foe Victorious, by the Rev. J. Ernest Rattenbury, D.D. (Epworth Press; 7s. 6d. net), consists of studies in the various events of the Christian Year from Easter to Trinity. The author concludes the Preface by saying, 'By a happy coincidence I am sending this Preface to the press on my eightieth birthday.' The book has all the wisdom and the mature scholarship and the deep insight of a man who has spent a lifetime in the study of Christ. Dr. Rattenbury has a gift for vivid phrase. 'Another remarkable confirmation of the living Christ is the fact that so many people hate Him.' 'John is the Galahad of the New Testament.' Speaking of Wrede's view that Paul's experience of Christ on the Damascus Road was an hallucination and that it yet altered Paul's whole life, he says that this 'requires a credulity . . . of which only sceptics are capable.' He speaks of the failure of certain Protestant theologians to realize that 'justification by faith was the door into the temple, as it were, of the Christian life, and not the central nave of the temple.' God believes in man. 'It is the devil, as the Book of Job shows, who is the great disbeliever in man—and certain theologians.' He connects Jesus' saying that He is going to prepare a place for His people with the picture of the Eastern dragoman who goes in advance to prepare everything for the welfare of the traveller. 'Paradise is what Jesus makes and where Jesus is.' 'The knowledge of Christ is always incomplete when it is merely a book knowledge.' He quotes George Macdonald's saying that the new-born child comes 'Out of the everywhere into here,' and then goes on to say, 'The Ascension means the reverse; it means out of here into the everywhere.' There is not a page in this book which has not things to stimulate and to challenge.

It is a pity that the references to the passages quoted from the Bible are seldom given. Dr. J. W. Bowman appears as Dr. G. W. Bowman. The Biblical spelling is Nathanael, not Nathaniel. On p. 14 line 2 there is an intrusive question mark. On p. 64 the breathing on εἶδεν is omitted.

Dr. F. C. Pritchard, M.A., has followed his recent study of Methodist education with a book in which the same theme is given particular application. *The Story of Westminster College, 1851–1951* (Epworth Press; 12s. 6d. net) is a centenary volume in commemoration of the work of Methodism's only College for the training of male day-school teachers.

Until 1851 Methodist teachers were trained at a private institution in Glasgow. The project to build a College in London was the natural outcome of the formation of a Connexional Education Committee, and marked the beginning of a half-century of Methodist interest in education during which eight hundred schools were built.

The history of Westminster College is thus long and distinguished. It owes much of its success to its line of famous Principals—John Scott (grandfather of the veteran Dr. Scott Lidgett), J. H. Rigg, H. B. Workman, and A. W. Harrison. These were outstanding men in Methodism and they brought to Westminster

abilities both educational and administrative of a very high order.

'Old W's' have every reason to be proud of their Alma Mater and they will read this book with enthusiasm. A wider public, too, will find much within its covers to interest and instruct.

The Rev. Ronald M. Ward, B.D., Minister of the Romford Congregational Church, who is indebted to the teaching and personal influence of Dr. Sydney Cave, has written a book called *Christian Certainties* (Independent Press; 6s. net). As Dr. Leslie Weatherhead explains in a Foreword, the book is set on a sound theological basis, though not an exposition of technical theology; it is composed of 'plain talks to plain men.' After chapters on the need and the grounds for certainty the author develops his exposition of Christian doctrine under the headings of 'God, in the light of Christ's Person,' 'Man, in the Light of Christ's Person,' 'God, in the light of Christ's Work,' 'Man, in the light of Christ's Work.' Those chapters are followed by one on 'The Outer Darkness' and another on 'The Eternal Light.'

The exposition of doctrine is on the lines of Biblical as distinct from dogmatic theology, and is often concretely presented. To illustrate what we mean, the truth of the Atonement is for the most part conveyed through a study of the *events* of the Upper Room, the Garden of Gethsemane, and the Cross of Calvary. As for the writer's standpoint, it is usually that of a conservative theology, though we observe a tendency to liberalize the New Testament teaching on such doctrines as those of the devil and destiny. We should add that the whole book strikes an authentic note of Christian experience.

In *The Idea of Development of the Soul in Medieval Jewish Philosophy* (Maurice Jacobs, Philadelphia; $2.00) Rabbi Philip David Bookstaber, M.A., Ph.D., Litt.D., of the Reformed Temple Ohev Sholom, Harrisburg, Pa., traces the thought of eight Jewish philosophers on the subject, from Isaac Ben Solomon Israeli (*c.* 832–932) to Moses Maimonides (1135–1204). His thesis is that 'Soul can be developed and that the individual may win or lose immortality of soul in so far as he is willing to recreate within himself the divine spark which is ever-present within him *in potentia*.' This thesis he finds borne out by the philosophers whose writings he examines. The view of the Rabbis was fundamentally different from that of Philo and Plato: they did not regard the body or the flesh as the source of impurity or sin, or as 'the prison house of the soul.' This was in accordance with Old Testament teaching. Nor had they, like St. Paul, any doctrine of 'original sin.' They recognized a *yetser*, a tendency, but never a compulsion toward sin. Man has the divine power, the freedom, to overcome the evil *yetser* by the good *yetser*, and the greatest men are those who can control the passions within their souls. Clearly this view, whether it be right or wrong, is different from that of evangelical Christianity. The logic of it is that salvation is by works.

In *Archaeology and the After-Life* (Lutterworth Press; 2s. 6d. net) the Rev. J. N. Schofield has printed a talk he gave in the B.B.C. Third Programme on the archaeological background to the Bible, together with lectures to the Vacation Term of Biblical Studies. The general view has been that the Hebrews believed that all men entered at death into Sheol, the dreary underworld of shades, and that it was only at the very end of the Old Testament period that any belief in a future life worthy of the name became explicit. Archaeology has made it clear that even in early Old Testament times there was belief in individual survival, and the view has accordingly gained ground that the conception of Sheol first became prominent in the teaching of the prophets, largely for the purpose of combating popular notions which were bound up with necromancy and other heathen cults. Mr. Schofield shows clearly that we cannot, in the light of archaeology, put Hebrew beliefs about the hereafter into any schematized form to accord with theories of 'progressive' linear development; that, indeed, such beliefs were probably as unco-ordinated and varied as are those of Christians to-day about the hereafter. Very suggestive is his characterization of the post-exilic priestly writings as 'the outcome of a "counter-reformation," a conservative return to religious forms and beliefs found in Palestine before the reforming activities of the great prophets.'

Where Mr. Schofield is not very convincing is in his attempt to show, if we understand him aright, that the prophets thought of Sheol as a place to which only the wicked went. 'We are given no hint that the righteous also were thought of as going down to Sheol.' He allows that Is 38 (the Psalm of Hezekiah) and Jon 2 are exceptions. They are indeed! Moreover, there are passages in the Psalms, not to mention Job $9^{7\text{-}21}$, which he quotes elsewhere, which make such a view very questionable.

The purpose of *The Unity of Isaiah: A Study in Prophecy*, by Dr. Oswald T. Allis, B.D. (Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., Philadelphia; $2.25), is indicated by its title. The corner-stone of proof that the second half of Isaiah is 'long-range prediction' is to be

found in Is 44^{24-28}, of which *v.* 24 refers to creation in the *distant* past, *vv.* 25. 26a to the present, and *vv.* 26*b*–28, presumably, to the *distant* future. Therefore, since Cyrus is predicted at long range in *v.* 28, the author cannot be any 'Deutero', but must be the eighth-century Isaiah! Dr. Allis criticises C. R. North ('The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah') for subscribing to the collective interpretation of the Servant, and, by failing 'to understand the Messianic interpretation,' completely demonstrating 'the disastrous results of the critical treatment of Biblical prophecy.' The truth is that North quite imagined that he was advocating the Christian Messianic interpretation. All through this book it is clear that the author's results are dogmatically controlled, and that his obsession with 'long-range prediction'—accurate and detailed description of the distant future—makes it impossible for him to read, except in blinkers, the work of those who do not subscribe to his presuppositions.

Divine Transcendence in the Old Testament, by the Rev. Hughell E. W. Fosbroke, D.D., LL.D., is the 1950 Winslow Memorial Lecture (Seabury-Western Theological Seminary, Evanston, Ill.; 26 pages). Dr. Fosbroke is concerned to correct what he considers to be the present one-sided emphasis on transcendence which underlies the reiteration of such phrases as 'wholly other,' 'the unknown God.' God as He is presented in the Old Testament is immanently active. 'It was a dynamic transcendence breaking in ever and again upon the normal course of human affairs in events of extraordinary revelatory import but also tirelessly at work within the whole process of nature and history.' This, surely, is the right emphasis.

In *The Polished Shaft* (S.P.C.K.; 7s. 6d. net) Miss W. E. M. Brown essays to trace the influence of three lesser eighteenth-century writers on the greater figures who came after them. First of the three is James Hervey, author of the once-famous 'Meditations and Contemplations.' Of this book twenty-five editions appeared in less than fifty years. Burns read it; Coleridge called it 'the classic of the vulgar'; Dr. Johnson parodied it in 'The Meditation of a Pudding.' Its florid, verbose, moralizing style makes it nowadays almost ludicrously unreadable; but all thanks are due to Miss Brown for bringing back the picture of Hervey himself. He was a man of such kindness that when he was in Bideford his friends formed the plan of borrowing money from him when he received his pay and returning it when they thought he needed it, because he instinctively gave it all away. He had a habit of sending his manuscripts to his friends for criticism, which he really wanted. He said to his friend Dr. Stonehouse, who wrote pious books but did not always live a pious life, 'Remember, my dear friend, when you are in company, you have written a pious book.'

Second of the three is William Cowper. There are phrases of Cowper which still flash out. He lays it down that,

> A terrible sagacity informs
> The poet's heart,

and he summons men to break 'Custom's idiot sway.' Third of the three is William Gilpin. Gilpin wrote books about the picturesque, but is chiefly remembered as a schoolmaster who, years before his time, made his pupils largely self-governing and in all cases strove to make the punishment fit the crime. Miss Brown reminds us that Sir Walter Scott declared that no one would become a schoolmaster but for a 'fortunate vanity,' who had 'arms to pare and burn a muir.' Miss Brown has been wandering in the byways, but she has come back laden with treasure for which we are truly grateful.

The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, Philadelphia, U.S.A., has published the principal articles written by the late Benjamin Breckinridge Warfield, Professor at Princeton Theological Seminary, 1887–1921, on the Person and Work of Jesus Christ. All the articles with one exception were included in the ten volumes of his collected writings—all of which are out of print—published by the Oxford University Press subsequent to his death. They are here divided into two groups, one dealing mainly with the Incarnation and the other with the Atonement. They have been republished in the belief that in their particular field they have not been superseded by any other writings. This is the second volume of the writings of Warfield published by the Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company. The first was entitled 'The Inspiration and Authority of the Bible.' This is entitled *The Person and Work of Christ* ($4.50).

That this company expects to republish more of the writings of Warfield is indicated, says Dr. Samuel G. Craig in the Foreword to this volume, by the fact that it has obtained the publication rights in all of the ten volumes of the collected writings of Warfield published by the Oxford University Press. Perhaps it should be added that Dr. Warfield was an able and staunch upholder of the traditional Christology and Soteriology and that he claimed Biblical authority for all his expositions, as became a theologian who stood for the Reformation principles of the Reformed Churches.

with the powers of the universe and amicable relations toward his God.'

With all our eagerness for some brilliant short-cut back to prosperity, some swift reform to set every old wrong right, we must not forget the humble ways in which God is our example and would have us for companions. If one can do a little, then that is worth doing. If it is some small thing, not showing much or making a story, yet useful, if it is some improvement but one that will take years to carry through, remember the Divine gentleness and patience. Devotion to duty and service in such ways will bring you into the company of God.

2. *Humble Spheres.* All that concerns the care and training of children is humble work. Is not the labour of love in a home in its drudgery and in its hopefulness like the work the Heavenly Father is constantly doing for all His children? Is there any work in which a man or woman can have a truer sense of being close to God? Does any work demand more self-surrender, more humility of mind than the teaching of the young? The work in schools and Sunday schools and youth organizations is laborious and inconspicuous. To choose such work, and find pleasure and pride in it, and in spite of weariness to do it with good will and fidelity, is one sure way of keeping near to God.

So with the care of the sick and all works of loving pity. So very specially in the missionary service of the Church. No people have spoken with such gladness and certainty of God's presence as those who, turning their backs on fame and fortune and the pleasant and gracious amenities of life, have spent their years in bringing the knowledge of Christ to remote places and unenlightened races. By the world's standards their careers were humble but they were not lonely. They walked with God.

The point of Micah's word is thus not that you should have humble feelings, but that you should do, and go on doing, humble things. It may mean putting away pride and ambition, and foregoing luxury and leisure, but it will not mean loneliness. It will take you into the company of God.

THIRTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

Spiritual Insight

BY THE REVEREND G. W. H. LOUDON, B.D., S.T.M., CALLANDER

'By faith we understand that the world was created by the word of God, so that what is seen was made out of things which do not appear.'—He 11^3 (R.S.V.).

We are not all born with a silver spoon in our mouths, but each one of us does come into life with a question, so to speak, on the tip of his tongue. From the moment when he first can speak to the moment when he can speak no longer, the 'human animal' is an animal that asks questions. This persistent questioning is not merely the expression of a desire to know—if by that we mean the desire to amass facts together. It is the outcome of the desire to *understand*, to fit things into the pattern, to make life less like the scattered pieces of a jigsaw puzzle, and more like the completed picture. We may not all be able to formulate our philosophies, but in our desire and in our intention we are all system-makers. The last words of the dying Goethe are in some measure true of us all. We all want 'more light, more light' to give us insight into the design of life, and to remove the troubles and the perplexities from the business of living.

Now it is the importance of this text before us that it undertakes to satisfy this universal human desire. Here is the way, it says in effect, by which you may arrive at a true picture of life, a true comprehension of the design and pattern of living. It is by faith that you will come to understanding; and without it, your insight will be uncertain, and your pattern of life will be blurred.

1. Consider, as a beginning, what this claim means; and perhaps the best way of putting it is to say that it extends the warning that St. Paul gives to the Corinthians—that only the spiritual man is able to understand spiritual things—and makes it applicable to the whole of life. In other words, it says that the perplexities of life are spiritual perplexities, that the problems of life are spiritual problems, and that the only insight worth having into the pattern and design for living is the insight which comes to the kind of people whom St. Paul would describe as 'spiritual men.'

That is, of course, a wholesale reversal of the customary opinion of the world. It has long been taken for granted that the possession of faith, in any strong degree, rendered a man or a woman quite incapable of forming an opinion on any problem, or seeing into the heart of any of the difficulties that normally afflict the human race. To call a man a saint is to imply that he is a simpleton, and the saying of Jesus to His disciples is all but forgotten, that they should be wise as serpents, as well as being innocent as doves. The pity of it is that we who are His disciples seem to have forgotten it too. We are willing to accept the world's assessment of our insight, our understanding, and to let ourselves be told how we ought to think about the great issues of living. And somehow we fail to note that those who criticise us, and are ready to set us right, have just the same *kind* of principle of understanding to go upon; they, too, form their judgments on a basis of faith, just as much as we. But it is a very

different faith, and one of the differences is just this, that they do not realize the part faith plays —their kind of faith, not ours—in the insights they obtain, and the understandings to which they come.

Suppose we take the example that our text suggests—the fact of the world's making, and men's understanding of the fact. It is not so long since a series of broadcast talks put before us a description of the process of Creation that was not only new but seemed to be quite startlingly different from all other earlier theories on the matter. But it had one thing in common with those earlier theories—and by that I mean the theories advanced by earlier men of science. It went on the assumption that the explanation of the Creation was to be found *within* the Creation. That was the article of faith from which it began, just as the earlier theories did. And that is the faith which is not denied but rejected as insufficient by the writer of Hebrews. And the reason for his rejecting it, if he were to express it in modern times, would run something like this: 'You have shown me only the mechanics of Creation. You have not shown me its meaning. And it is the meaning that gives understanding.'

Or again, take the example of history. The quotation is well known from H. A. L. Fisher's *History of Europe* in which he tells how he has been unable to find any pattern or rhythm or harmony in history. In other words, he does not know the *meaning* of history; he does not have any *understanding* of what history is for. And the reason, once again, is that he has expected to find these things *within* history itself. He has refused to go beyond history, or to admit even the possible existence of One who may be history's Lord. His faith—and by that I mean the whole set of assumptions about man and life and the world which he brought to the writing of his book—did not have room in it for that. It was the wrong kind of faith.

2. What then is the right kind? What is the nature of the faith which will furnish us with a true understanding of life's pattern alike in the natural creation and in the works of men? In the view of our text, it is the faith which consists essentially in a right relationship toward God; or to go back once again to St. Paul's words to the Corinthians, it is the faith which results in our having the mind of Christ.

And once again we seem to be dealing with a complete reversal of the common line of thought amongst men—the line of thought that was expressed in the couplet of Alexander Pope:

> Know then thyself, presume not God to scan,
> The proper study of mankind is man.

But to that sentiment not just this text but the whole of the Bible offers a determined opposition. For the Bible is convinced that the proper study of mankind is God; and what is more, that mankind will not get its study of man into the right perspective unless it begins with faith in God, and the committal of itself to Him.

And when one thinks of it—how reasonable a proposition that is! We all know that when we are, so to speak, out of tune with our surroundings, the result is apt to show itself in the twisted judgments we form, and the jaundiced outlook we acquire. But when the breach of harmony is not between us and our environment, but between us and Him in whom we live and move and have our being, isn't it likely that the resulting distortion of outlook and of judgment will be far greater? Isn't it a reasonable inference that a right adjustment of our spiritual relationship is the best contribution that can be made toward the deepening of our insights and the enlightening of our understandings? And what is 'a right adjustment of our spiritual relationships' if it is not faith?

3. 'By faith we understand'—by the way of faith we arrive at the place of understanding. But what difference does it make, once we get there? Is there any practical value in this search after insight, and does it matter so very much if after all we do not find the right answer to the jigsaw puzzle of life? No doubt to find it might be very satisfying to our curiosity, but can it ever be anything more?

That *is* the kind of question that is bound to be asked whenever we think aloud along the lines we have been following just now. There can be no doubt, there must be no hesitation, about the answer. If you disregard the place of understanding, and neglect the insight it has to offer, you endanger the whole structure of human existence, and the whole scale of human values. If there is no meaning to be assigned to the Creation, and if all we can point to are the mechanics of its happening, then we and our world are no better than the dead leaves you see in Autumn—sometimes lying in the ditch, and sometimes tossed by the wind into the air. If there is no meaning from beyond history to be applied to history, then every attempt to do good to men of other nations, at the expense of our own, is utterly stupid, and every striving to uphold the rights of man as man is a championing of what does not exist. For it is only when we see men, and understand them, with the mind of Christ, that we see any value or worth in them *as men*. It is only when we try to see the world as it looks to Him who made it and still is at work in it, that we, too, can pronounce it to be 'very good.'

'Faith' in James and its Bearings on the Problem of the Date of the Epistle.

By the Reverend Cyril H. Powell, B.A., Newcastle-under-Lyme.

It is important to distinguish between two strains regarding 'faith' in James. They exist side by side without their author being conscious, apparently, of their disparity. The failure to distinguish between them has led to much misunderstanding concerning 'faith' in the intervening centuries.

The first strain is purely intellectual—the typical assent to items of belief—and the second is dynamic, by which the power of God is brought into operation and changes take place.

(1) *The Intellectual Strain.* The belief that 'God is one' is the 'faith' at which James tilts in 2^{19}. Common to Jew and Christian alike, this is the minimal article of their religion (cf. Dt 6^{4}, Mk 12^{29}). To this James would add belief in the Christian revelation, in the Divine Law or Word, and in Jesus Christ (*sic. Moffatt New Testament Commentary: The General Epistles*, 39).

It is this intellectual form of faith that needs to be backed up and substantiated by works. Without the appropriate deeds following belief, faith is barren and dead ($2^{17.\ 20}$). What a man does should grow out of his beliefs.

(2) *The Dynamic Attitude.* Any lacking 'wisdom' are to ask in faith, nothing doubting, and they will be given it ($1^{5.\ 6}$). The prayer of faith, we are told in 5^{15}, 'shall save the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he have committed sins, they shall be forgiven him.' It is in connexion with this latter passage ($5^{13.\ 18}$) that we are given the illustration of Elijah, who, in the Hebrew idiom, 'prayed earnestly' (προσευχῇ προσηύξατο) and with such effect that it did not rain for three and a half years, and, at the end of that time, he prayed again and the drought was brought to an end. 'The prayers of the righteous have a powerful effect' (5^{16} [Moffatt]).

It is significant that for his illustration of effective prayer James has recourse to Elijah. It is typical of his whole Epistle, in which obvious Christian references seem to be intentionally avoided. Our Lord would, of course, have provided the perfect illustration of dynamic faith and the power to heal, which is the point being made in the passage, but Elijah perhaps affords a more valuable example because he is a typical Old Testament figure, and also because he is 'a man subject to like passions as we are.' Already Christological categories are setting the example of our Lord apart from the rest of us. But what can happen to Elijah, James is arguing, can happen to any other man of like stamp, if he will find a dynamic faith as effective as his.

This kind of faith is, in the nature of the case, not divorced from works. To exercise it involves an inward dynamism, and the appropriate action, whenever called for, would naturally follow (cf. the touch of Jesus, and the action in Ac 3^{7} by which Peter took the lame man by the hand and lifted him up. The anointing with oil [Ja 5^{14}], which accompanies the 'prayer of faith,' has about it something of this character).

Faith and Justification. The controversy in Ja $2^{14ff.}$ is often interpreted as levelled against the Pauline conception of justifying faith. That this should be so is, in part, due to the fact that Paul has merged something of the two elements in 'faith' that are shown quite separately in James. In the truly Pauline faith the dynamism that James thinks of in connexion with healing has interfused with the intellectual element in belief; and this form of belief becomes so effective that it means a change of spiritual relationship and inward personality. (Note that James' dynamic faith affects spiritual relationships, too. He thinks of *forgiveness*, as well as of healing, in connexion with the 'prayer of faith' 5^{15}.) Those who misunderstood Paul were those who left out this element of dynamism, and thought that mere belief, on the intellectual level, in itself would result in justification, whereas it is the inner committal alone that can have such a result. This inner committal results in new and appropriate action, so that here too faith and works cannot really be thought of as sundered. 'Faith works by love' (Gal 5^{6}), says St. Paul, and his justified sinner declares his new state by acting in accord with the new ethic that Paul makes abundantly clear in all his epistles.

Windisch (*Die katholischen Briefe* [1930], 20 f.) says that this discussion in Ja 2 is explicable even apart from Paul. 'In no case can the polemic of James be directed against Paul, and in spite of strong echoes of Gal 2^{16} 3^{6}, Ro 3^{28} $4^{2.\ 12}$ it is improbable that James had read these letters, or that Paul had read James and directed his polemic against him. What is common to the two is to be explained from the dependence of both on Jewish tradition.'

Pauline justifying faith has as its object Christ's

death and resurrection. The dynamism of this faith comes in the identification with all that these involve and promise, by which one may die to sin and rise again in Christ to newness of life. As we have seen, the faith which James labels as useless, apart from works, is the minimal belief in God's oneness and His existence.

There is no comparison possible between James and Paul, comments Martin Dibelius,[1] since Paul is a missionary who speaks out of his vocation and experience, while James accepts the current view of faith and is merely concerned to guard against abuse. Ro 10^9 provides a similar instance in Paul of this typical Jewish 'faith'; in this, faith in Christ becomes the Christianized version of faith regarded as attachment to Israel, the community founded in God.

'It is impossible that the author would have opposed the Epistle to the Romans in this way if he had read it thoroughly and understood it,' writes Dibelius.[2] He claims that James stems from a type of primitive Christianity not directly influenced by Paul, or he would have understood him better or made his opposition clearer.

It is significant that James never uses Paul's typical phrase 'works of the law,' which he could hardly have avoided doing if he had Paul's arguments in mind.

G. J. Knowling in his Commentary on *The Epistle of James*, refers to Jülicher (*Einleitung*, 143), who urges that the Epistle presupposes the misuse of Paul's teaching as to faith. 'But,' says Knowling, 'we may fairly ask what part of that teaching. . . .' He continues, 'If St. James was trying to guard against perversions of St. Paul's teaching, it is strange that he should quote the same passage, Gn xv. 6 which St. Paul employs, Ro iv. 1–8, and that he should simply content himself with drawing from it his own conclusion, without seeking to invalidate St. Paul's deductions by any explanations.'

Date. Because of its relationship with the dynamic faith of the Synoptic Gospels, and its passages about the impossibility of 'justification' by intellectual faith alone, the date of James has a great bearing on the general understanding of what happened to the term 'faith' in the New Testament.

The strongest case for a late date is based on the internal evidence of the Epistle itself. The many references to teaching and to teachers (*e.g.*, 3^1: 'Be not many teachers') suggests that it is not written to a community (or communities) still in the missionary stage, but to a settled group. What this community now needs is sound moral teaching to prevent deterioration.

[1] *Der Brief des Jacobus* [1921], 163 f.

[2] *Ib.*, 167.

According to this view, the situation is much the same as that of the Pastorals. Christianity has hardened into Institution, plus Doctrine, plus Good Works. The writer of James, as contrasted with the author(s) of the Pastorals, is concerned lest the Institution and the Doctrine shall overwhelm the Good Works; and he, therefore, in writing to the same situation emphasizes the opposite point of view to the Pastorals. He is dissatisfied with the state of affairs that the Pastorals accept. Faith as the acceptance of sound doctrine would be applauded by the author of the Pastorals. James sees its danger. He attacks it, not in the way that Luther was to do later, but in the moralist's way: he is anxious that the insistence on the need for Good Works shall not be overlooked. This point of view would therefore accord to James the same kind of date as the Pastorals.

Moffatt, in his introduction to James in his Commentary on the General Epistles, is cautious as to the date. Provisionally, he says, it may be placed between about 70 and 90. 'If it could be shown that Clement of Rome, towards the end of the first century, used James, this would fix the date of James still further, as being not later than about A.D. 90.' (Actually there are some close parallels in Clement, *e.g.*, Clem 38^2 and Ja 3^{13}; Clem 46^5 and Ja 4^1. Knowling points out [Introd. to *Commentary*, p. i.] that Clement, who also lays great stress on the sin of doublemindedness, uses the same word as James; and notes 11^2 and 23^3 in which the thought of God's judgment is closely associated with this sin.)

Moffatt points out the affinity of the Epistle to the Wisdom literature. (See Knowling, pp. xv. and xvi. for an impressive list of parallels with Ecclesiasticus and the Book of Wisdom.) The Epistle has the same kind of ragged construction as Ecclesiastes. There is no continuous argument running right through it: sometimes one meets with a paragraph of argument, and sometimes a series of aphorisms. This literary background, and the aphoristic Greek in which the letter is written, is thought to militate against the possibility that it could have been written by James the Lord's brother.[3]

Spitta, some years ago, put forward the theory

[3] Kittel, in an appendix to *Die Probleme des palästinischen Spätjudentums und das Unchristum*, discusses 3^{26} and the phrase that many find it difficult to understand could come from James the Lord's brother. He finds the metaphor of the wheel used for the round of human life and fortune in rabbinic tradition. He traces this back to *c.* A.D. 150. The idea may well have come in from outside (*e.g.*, Orphism or India) but it may well have been acclimatized in Palestine in the time of Jesus.

which time, I imagine, its captors thought it was theirs for good. But when it was released and its wings were re-grown it took the first chance that offered of getting free and, straight as an arrow, winged its way home. Why should it be able to do that? Well, nobody definitely knows. It is simply instinct, as we say.

There is something similar now, isn't there, in you and me, too? We have all heard, I daresay, what Wordsworth wrote:

trailing clouds of glory do we come
From God, who is our home.

For, since we come from God, within us, too, there is an instinct or a feeling for God. That was what another wise man, St. Augustine, meant when he said that 'our hearts are restless till they find their rest in Thee.' There are some people who, like the poor pigeon with the clipped wings, smother that feeling, but it is there, deep down, all the time, guiding us, pointing us longingly back to God, who is our Father and our Friend.

The Christian Year

TENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

A Nature That Can Be Touched

BY THE REVEREND STEWART MECHIE, M.A., GLASGOW

'I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh.'—Ezk 36^{26}.

Here is a quotation from a medical psychotherapist who practises in Harley Street: 'I have known many patients disappointed in their love affairs who have decided in self-defence to short-circuit love altogether, and cut it out of life because it hurt too much. Some of these go so far as to cut out not only love, but also all feeling and all sentiment. . . . Perhaps the mother died when the child was young, and the sudden weaning was unbearable; or perhaps at a tender age, after experiencing much tenderness, the child was suddenly thrown into the toughness of a boarding-school. Finding this too much to bear, he short-circuited, and pretended he was tough, to cover and assuage intolerable tenderness.' That is how Ezekiel's 'stony heart' is sometimes produced. Tragedy, sorrow, or misfortune may do it. We become rebellious and resentful. We steel ourselves against the pain, and 'steel ourselves' is an apt description, indeed, for in the process the heart, the inner nature, grows bitter toward God and often callous toward the troubles of others—a veritable process of hardening.

It is not, however, the pain of life only that can produce the stony heart. Sin also can do it, especially sin against the light. When we crush down the voice of conscience within us and in disobedience go our own way; when we refuse to respond to some call of God, nothing may seem to have been lost. Nevertheless the results follow inevitably, and one of these is just a certain hardening of the nature, a lost sensitiveness to goodness and a deadness to nobler things. Burns knew what he was talking about and, as usual, chose the right words, when he wrote—

But oh! it hardens a' within,
And petrifies the feeling!

And that is true not only of sensuality but of all sin against the light.

It is likely that both these causes of the stony heart were at work among the people whom Ezekiel was addressing. They were Jewish exiles in Babylon, belonging to that people whose unresponsiveness and obdurate persistence in evil ways had often dismayed Ezekiel's prophetic predecessors, making them feel that they had spent their labour in vain. No doubt that 'stony heart' of theirs was in large measure the result of those sins, personal and social, which earlier prophets like Amos had denounced. There was, however, another reason why the exiles in Babylon should be unresponsive. They had suffered. They had seen their capital, Jerusalem, laid waste, their temple destroyed, their king a captive, their national life almost blotted out. Some, perhaps, were rebellious under those strokes of fate: some were stunned and hopeless: some had steeled themselves against the pain. In one way or another these people had lost the power to feel. Their nature had gone hard, their heart stony. It was their hardness, their unresponsiveness to God, and God's appeal through His prophet, that chiefly vexed Ezekiel; but we may be sure that that hardness was matched by a corresponding hardness in regard to their fellows. The sensitiveness toward God and toward man cannot finally be separated: the one reacts on the other.

Ezekiel, however, looks forward to a spiritual process whereby these people, so hard and unresponsive, are to be transformed into a true people of God. The first step is forgiveness, represented in verse 25 by the figure of sprinkling with clean water, and the second step is mentioned in verse 26—the giving of a new heart or new nature no longer hard but sensitive. 'I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh,' or as Dr. Moffatt felicitously puts it: 'I will take away your hard nature and give you a nature that can be touched.'

Perhaps some of us are not anxious to have such a nature. To have a nature that can be touched, to be able to feel keenly, is not always a

happy thing. Too often it means pain, and we shrink from pain. But what is the alternative? It is to have a stony heart, a hard nature. It is to be insensitive, and that is well on the way to being dead. At the funerals of the Czars of Russia two soldiers used to ride in the cortege as Black Knight and White Knight, representing Death and Life. The Black Knight's armour was an ancient heavy suit, and the strongest guardsman was chosen to wear it. At the funeral of one Czar the man dropped dead on the way: at that of another he died shortly after. So it is with hearts that have encased themselves in the armour of hardness against the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune. It kills while it may seem to protect.

You remember how Robert Louis Stevenson, aware of the danger of becoming insensitive, prays God to use all means, even the sorest, to keep him responsive—

> Lord, Thy most pointed pleasure take
> And stab my spirit broad awake;
> Or, Lord, if too obdurate I,
> Choose Thou, before that spirit die,
> A piercing pain, a killing sin,
> And to my dead heart run them in!

Without sensitiveness, without a nature that can be touched, we must miss all the finest experiences of life—friendship, usefulness to others in their need, the power to love and to know the love of others, and, above all, the sense of the love of God.

How, then, does God fulfil this promise to restore the nature that can be touched? Sometimes we can see how He does it. It may be through an experience which may not inaptly be called a 'pointed pleasure.' Take, for instance, George Eliot's Silas Marner. Falsely accused by one who had seemed his friend, he was tried by lot and the lot went against him; whereupon he hardened himself against God and man, and in the course of years became almost dead in miserliness. Then came the 'pointed pleasure' in the shape of the little child, Eppie, who came out of the unknown to share his cottage. She it was who melted his frozen nature, and led him back to life and love again.

May we go so far as to use Stevenson's phrase and say that God can use even a 'killing sin'? Yes, indeed we may. The killing sin that stabs the spirit broad awake may show itself in oneself. Bulwer-Lytton, the novelist, on a visit to Paris, once gambled, staking more than he could afford; but he won. On his return that night he went to lock up his gains in a desk over which hung a mirror. Aghast at the look on his own face, with its traces of ignoble emotion, he resolved never to gamble again. He had been stabbed awake. Again, the killing sin may show itself in the hurt done to others. In one of the ups and downs of the friendship between Richard Wagner and Franz Liszt, Wagner wrote to his friend, after a particularly glaring instance of lack of thoughtfulness, 'Your pain has made me see the ugliness of what I did.' What, indeed, has so availed to stab men broad awake and break their hard hearts as just the sight at Calvary of the killing sin of crucifying the Christ—sinful men seeking to put away and destroy the Holy and Loving Son of God?

We must not, however, try to limit God as to His ways of fulfilling this most gracious promise. To our human view the work of the Holy Spirit is mysterious, though the results of that work may be triumphantly evident.

> Down in the human heart, crushed by the tempter,
> Feelings lie buried that grace can restore

What we can do, indeed must do, is to realize this danger of the hardening of our natures, and be vigilant against it, especially in this age of war and war's baneful aftermath. What we must do is to pray that God will fulfil and keep on fulfilling this promise—that He will keep us sensitive, responsive to Himself and responsive to our fellows, richly blest, by His mercy, in having a nature that can be touched.

ELEVENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

The Snare of Pride

BY THE REVEREND N. H. G. ROBINSON, D.LITT., ROTHESAY

'God resisteth the proud, but giveth grace unto the humble.'—Ja 4^{6}.

There is a grandeur about the Christian Faith which is the grandeur of the truth itself. No doubt there are times in the history of mankind when by so many the Christian Faith is ignored and despised; but it is important for our own faith not to misunderstand that very obvious fact. The Christian Faith may certainly be ignored and despised by the crowd, but there are always a few who treasure it, who *really* treasure it as the very breath of life itself. As for the many, it is not that with open eyes and without prejudice they have chosen to reject the Christian Faith; it is rather that they have drifted away from it, have unconsciously and imperceptibly parted company with it and are ignorant now of the direction in which they travel. Surely Jesus was right when He said that the mass of men were *lost*, not that

hey had deliberately chosen the lesser good, but imply that they had lost their way. It was as f they were blind, and instead of striding forward oward the light they were actually stumbling long in the dark. But when by the discipline of ife and by the grace of God they can put aside heir preconceived ideas and face up fairly and quarely to the demands and promises of this Christian Faith, then they are constrained to cknowledge that this is indeed the truth, the final nd absolute truth of all things. Like the man in he New Testament they are constrained to confess, one thing I know, that, whereas I was blind, now I see.' Or as Andrew Young has paraphrased it,

I was not blind and yet He gave me sight;
I was not deaf and yet He gave me hearing;
Nor was I dead, yet me He raised to life.

It was not a controversial theory that Christ ame to expound; it was a new dimension He pened up. Just as there are men whose ear for nusic has not been quickened there are those to whom the Christian gospel is foolishness and the Cross of Christ a stumbling-block. But to those who hear the call it is the power of God and the very wisdom of God. It is, in a word, the truth itself. And regarding those who resist or ignore His claims Christ has ultimately only one thing to say, not an argument, not even an exhortation, but a prayer, the prayer He uttered when the Crucifixion was an accomplished fact, 'Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do.' *They know not what they do.* The Christian gospel meets with a mixed reception in every age; but it is blindness, let us note, it is human blindness that marches side by side with obedience, faith, and incipient love.

But, in the second place, we can carry this matter further and deeper, for it is the proud of heart who are blind, who simply do not see the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ His Son. It is the proud of heart who resist God and whom God resisteth while He giveth grace to the humble. The Christian gospel lays a judgment upon us and upon all mankind; and if anything is clear it is this, that the judgment is not that we are rich or poor, not that we are clever or dull, not even that we are good or bad, but that we are humble or proud. Everything turns upon that, upon whether we look out upon life from a prayer-stool or a pedestal. It was upon men's humility, upon their reachableness, that Jesus chose to build, not upon the largeness of their love, not upon the breadth of their benevolence, not upon their compassion nor their righteousness, but upon their humility before God. For the sacrifices of God are a broken spirit; a broken and a contrite heart He will not despise. God can do something with the humble, He can give grace to the humble, He can give Himself and His Kingdom to the humble; but as for the proud, God resisteth the proud.

Thus we speak of the snare of pride. Thus, too, and for the same reason, we see at the very heart of religion the sacrifice of a broken spirit, the self-surrender of one that is humble. Perhaps we see it most impressively and most clearly in the call of Simon, although at first sight it all seems so ordinary and the significance of the occasion is liable to escape our notice. Jesus, you remember, had been talking to a throng of people, and having finished He turned to Simon. Launch out into the deep, He said, and let down your nets for a draught. A perfectly ordinary scene, one might think? A perfectly innocent request? Just an idle suggestion to pass the time when an important task has been accomplished? But no, this was a deliberate application of the gospel to Simon's life, a deliberate approach of God's purposes to his; and who can tell what lay in the balance in that moment of time between the command of the Master and the reply of this simple fisherman whom He had chosen?

For one thing, as Dr. J. S. Stewart has pointed out, this innocent request actually called in question the painfully gathered experience of Simon, for who knew better than he that if you had toiled all night and caught nothing you had little chance of making a catch in the bright light of the sun? But, more than that, his professional code and conscience were also under stress. If in the life of the fisherman there is one virtue that stands out above the others it is surely patience, the readiness to bide one's time and wait till the tide of fortune turns. It is only the novice, full of enthusiasm but inexperienced and undisciplined, it is only the novice who is ready to try his hand and cast his net whenever the notion takes him. This command of Christ's was an offence to Simon's conscience as well as to his experience; and yet he knew that in this simple encounter his life, with all its standards and ideals, its lessons and its hopes, had been caught up into something far bigger than he had ever dreamed, into the very life and purpose of the living God. And this recognition had already paved the way for all that was to follow, Simon's confession of unworthiness and his forsaking of everything to follow Jesus.

There is always a forsaking and a surrender when you follow Jesus, a forsaking perhaps of material things, but above all a forsaking of preconceived ideas and prejudices and even ideals, a surrender of the very best you know to let in the infinitely better that God gives. Humility of heart, forsaking and surrender, these things all hang inseparably together, and they cling

inalienably to the life of a Christian, not only at the beginning but to the very end. Remember that after months and years of the closest companionship with Jesus it was Simon who was rebuked as Satan. 'Get thee behind me, Satan: thou art an offence unto me: for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but those that be of men.' Remember that it was the scribes and Pharisees, acknowledged heirs of a long religious tradition, who confronted by the Word made flesh could not rest until they had accomplished His destruction. Remember above all that it was the Son of God Himself who rejected the title 'Good.' There is none good, He said, but one, that is, God—God who resisteth the proud but giveth grace to the humble.

TWELFTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

In August Company

BY THE REVEREND R. W. STEWART, B.D., B.Sc., GLASGOW

'Walk humbly with thy God.'—Mic 6^8.

Micah is a little noticed prophet. Yet it has been given to few men to say so memorable a thing as when he put beautifully in short, simple words the whole rule of righteousness. 'What doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?' The sentence unites men of all creeds, and even none, in a common aspiration.

When on some occasion our monarch sets out across the ocean to visit a far land, hundreds of seamen, and hundreds of homes from which they have come, are thrilled with pride that they should be making the voyage in the company of the King. In the end of that sentence Micah tells men how they may travel the road of life in august company. 'Walk humbly with—that is, along with—God.'

'With God' is 'beside God,' 'in God's company.' Micah is not, like Peter in his First Epistle, thinking about humbling oneself before God, confessing our sin, looking up to Him with awe, remembering that we are dust. That is, of course, a true thought, though it is not Micah's meaning here. What he says, and it carries in the Hebrew a great emphasis, is 'walk humbly,' and then he adds, 'along with God.' What is in his mind is not reverence but companionship, as when it is said in Genesis, 'Enoch walked with God.' The reference is not to the humble heart but to the humble life. Proud livers are far not only from their fellows but from God. But if a man walk humbly, he will find himself not alone but in the company of God.

For God Himself is humble. 'God is mighty yet despiseth not any,' we read in Job. He is the patient, tireless servant of His creation. 'Who is like unto the Lord our God, that hath his seat on high, that humbleth himself to behold the things that are in heaven and in the earth?' God stoops to conquer. God is love, and love is not proud but humble. Jesus revealed the heart of God even when He said, 'Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart.'

1. *Humble Methods.* God uses small things and gentle ways and slow processes, and so must the humble man. God's ways seen in Nature teach this lesson. 'They that go down to the sea in ships,' said one Psalmist, 'these see the works of the Lord.' He was thinking of great storms. Yet while storms are indeed impressive they are not the most impressive of His doings. 'He maketh grass to grow upon the mountains,' says another Psalmist, and is not that a more wonderful thing? Men can imitate thunder and lightning, but no one ever made a seed that would grow. The gentlest things may seem the most mysterious of all. Lord Kelvin in one lecture, after discussing and dismissing as unsatisfactory every explanation of the formation of dew, said that more than anything else the dewdrop made him believe in God.

And God's patience is infinite. At the end of the long process of creation men are here, children of His spirit, capable of returning His love, and God would draw them into fellowship with Himself. Yet He is patient, humble, waiting for men, not forcing them. While love and death and sin make the situation urgent and tragic for men, how much more so to the loving heart of God. Yet as He calls, He leaves men free to refuse. 'Come unto me,' says Jesus, and it is pleading, not compulsion, 'for,' He says, 'I am meek and lowly in heart.'

We rebel against the need to take time. As a boy I wanted in wood-work to fasten everything with nails, and could not understand my grandfather's contentment to put pieces together with glue and set the article aside for a whole day to dry. So in business we want quick returns. We think a five years' plan slow. We forget that some cathedrals took five centuries. The grandiose plan for the tower of Babel brought no blessing. But in a farmer's labour at seed time and harvest, and in making and mending the tools and furnishings for home and field as Jesus did, and in all kinds of simple necessary patient toil, men are drawn into a sense of co-operation with the Creator. There is much truth in what R. L. Stevenson wrote: 'One who has grown a long while in the sweat of laborious noons and under the stars at night, a frequenter of hills and forests, an old honest countryman has in the end a sense of communion

that the writing was originally a Jewish document touched up for Christian uses. (*E.g.*, the addition of a few words at 1^1 and 2^1.) This hypothesis is now no longer held, since it has to explain why the touching up is so slight!

The contenders for a late date would say, in the main, that it is the work of a single writer at the end of the first century incorporating a certain amount of traditional material, which would come, in some cases, from previous teachers in the Church (including sayings of the Lord which cannot be identified).

Early Date. Knowling (Introd. to *Commentary*, p. xxiv.) points out the similarity of the greeting in 1^1 with the salutation in the letter sent out by James, the Lord's brother, in Ac 15^{23}. He says that out of the two hundred words in that circular letter, Ac 15^{23}, and the speech delivered by James at the Council, Ac $15^{13ff.}$, a large number recur in the Epistle of James.

He further quotes Zahn, who places the Jerusalem Council about the beginning of A.D. 52, as dating the Epistle c. the year 50, when, before the first missionary journey of Paul and Barnabas, practically all the churches would be composed of converted Jews and Jewish proselytes.[1]

There is no denying the strongly Jewish flavour of this Epistle (*e.g.*, $2^{8\text{-}11.\ 21}$ $5^{12.\ 20}$) and there are in it many indications that have Palestinian references. (Cadoux, *The Thought of James*, 30, notes 5, 7 and the καύσων [1^{11}], the scorching wind from the desert, peculiar to Palestine. 'Where, except in Palestine,' he asks, 'would a moralist, thinking of the abuse of great wealth in farming, speak only of hired labourers and not of slavery?') The Greek is infected with Hebraisms ($5^{2.\ 17}$).

G. Kittel[2] says that James belongs to the world of Palestinian wisdom teaching and literature, and remarks that there need be no objection to authorship by James on the ground of language, since many Galileans would be bilingual. (It is quite possible that the LXX would be widely used by interested students in that area, since Hebrew had passed from common usage, and there was no current translation into Aramaic.) Kittel suggests elsewhere that James may have had the letter written for him by some Hellenistic Jew in Jerusalem, perhaps a member of Stephen's circle.[3]

W. Michaelis (*Einleitung in das Neue Testament* [1946]) refers to the close contacts with the teaching of Jesus revealed in the Epistle (p. 281), and states that the arguments so far brought forth have not shown the early date this suggests to be impossible. In arguing against a late date (p. 286 ff.) he asks what would be the point of ascribing a letter pseudonymously to James the Lord's brother who had long ceased to count for anything? It was written, according to his account, just after A.D. 50, and is thus the earliest Christian writing we possess.

All the references in the Epistle are to a very early stage of church organization. Moffatt himself points out that it was 'written to churches still governed by presbyters; they and teachers are the only officials mentioned.' There is a complete lack of any references to bishops—and what a contrast this provides to the Pastorals!

The fact that no problems seem to exist as between Jew and Christian would help to place the Epistle in very early days, before missionary work amongst the Gentiles had sharpened the points of difference between the upholders of Mosaic law and the new type of Christian introduced by St. Paul. It would need to be written before the war of 66–70, when Christianity became quite separate from Judaism.

The allusions to James that may be found in Clement of Rome, and indeed his attempts to strike a balance as between Paul and James (31^2; cf. Ja 2^{22}; 34^4, etc.) and the dependence of 1 Peter upon parts of the Epistle, would indicate that it must have had a fairly general circulation before Clement and 1 Peter were written.

On the balance of possibilities, we therefore favour an early date, and incline to the view that it is the James of Jerusalem, 'the Lord's brother,' who was its author.

Implications of a Late Date. A late date would provide us with the enigma of the unresolved tension between the two views of faith, the dynamic and the intellectual, continuing across many decades of Christian history, at the same time that Paul had worked out such a notable fusion between the two views. This would be the case, moreover, in a letter that, presupposing its lateness, must be attacking some perverted form of Paulinism!

Dibelius (*Der Brief des Jacobus* [1921], 167) who accords the Epistle a date between A.D. 80 and 130 thinks that James stems from a type of primitive Christianity not directly influenced by Paul; but, he thinks, James' language is not intelligible except on the assumption that he wrote after Paul had coined the slogan, 'faith not works.' The author, says Dibelius, is a Christian of the once-born type. He does not oppose every group which appeals to Paul but he is a teacher and sees the danger which lies in the slogan 'faith not works.'

This primitive type of Christianity would have to persist in some corner of the Church where misunderstood echoes of Paul's teaching of Justification by Faith had penetrated, but where,

[1] Introd. to *Commentary*, p. xxxvii.

[2] *Ib.*, 59 f.

[3] Quoted Michaelis, p. 287.

Perhaps, however, it is worth noting E. F. Scott's statement about the Philonic doctrine (*The Fourth Gospel: Its Purpose and Theology* [Edinburgh, 1908], 151): 'The Logos appears sometimes as only an aspect of the activity of God, at other times as a "second God," an independent and, it might seem, a personal being.' We have seen that 'and the Word was (a) God' is a possible, if unlikely, translation of καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος. This is the translation apparently accepted by E. F. Scott. But is it likely that St. John would have entertained the Philonic idea of a 'second God'? He may, at any rate, have modified it to the extent of identifying the Word with God, in spite of the resulting contradiction in the opening sentence of his Gospel. '"The Logos was God (θεός)," *i.e.* in His essential nature He was Deity' (G. T. Purves, 'Logos' in *HDB*, iii. 133).

J. Gwyn Griffiths.

University College, Swansea.

'Arepo' in the 'Sator' Square

Since its discovery at Pompeii, the magic square, which can be read in four different directions, is once again in the centre of interest.[1] Its better-known form is: 'The Sower Arepo holds the wheels with care.' Probably the other form is older: 'The wheels with care holds Arepo the Sower.' Here are both:

1. SATOR	2. ROTAS
AREPO	OPERA
TENET	TENET
OPERA	AREPO
ROTAS	SATOR

The difference is irrelevant for the purpose of this note. Either version, as is widely accepted, is made up of PATERNOSTER twice over, and necessarily arranged as a cross (since the middle letter, N, appears only once in the square), plus the symbolic letters A and O twice over. That is to say, either version is a cryptogram of:

A
P
A
T
E
R
APATERNOSTERO
O
S
T
E
R
O

[1] See the latest discussion by D. Atkinson, in *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, ii. [1951] 1 ff.

One word in the square is still unexplained: 'Arepo.' Many derivations have been attempted—the most recent from Celtic—but none is at all convincing. It is submitted that the simplest solution may be to see in it a Hebrew or Aramaic rendering of ἄλφα ὦ; cf. Rev 1^8 21^6 22^{13}. As has just been remarked, the author made use of the symbolic letters A and O, in addition to PATERNOSTER. Clearly, if it can be shown that he intended ἄλφα ὦ as the name of the 'Sower,' his square will make fairly good sense: 'The Sower Alpha O holds the wheels with care.'

Normally, ἄλφα ὦ, in Hebrew or Aramaic, would give 'alep o.' Here it is 'arep o'. Why? In both these languages, *l* and *r* are very close indeed. That writers from early times were conscious of the fact is shown by the pun in Mic 1^{13}: *rekhesh—lakhish*. In Greek also, *l* sometimes becomes *r*. The author, then, may have put 'arepo' as the nearest thing to 'alepo' he was able to attain. 'Arepo' followed from PATERNOSTER and, read backwards, supplied a suitable word, 'opera'; 'alepo' did neither; so 'arepo' it had to be. ('His name was not Bun but Wood, but Wood would not rhyme with gun but Bun would.') Considering the enormous difficulty of constructing such a square, he did not do too badly. However, it is possible that a slight twist of this kind was even desired. The modified forms of the tetragrammaton, or the spelling 'Eloqim' for 'Elohim,' may be recalled.

The view that 'Arepo' means 'alep o' has a bearing on the question of the provenance of the square. It is not, however, proposed here to go into it, beyond observing that a Jewish-Christian origin might account for several features which have puzzled scholars.

David Daube

The University, Aberdeen

Philippians i. 12–19

With special reference to *vv.* 15. 16. 17

It is generally assumed that the object of attack of the Church group which the words τινὲς μὲν (*v.*[15]) introduce is Paul himself. The purpose of this note is to dispute this assumption and suggest that the group is opposing the civil authorities responsible for Paul's imprisonment, past or present, in Cæsarea, Ephesus, or Rome.

For *vv.*[15-17] there are two traditional lines of

interpretation—one (A) affirming, the other (B) denying that τινὲς μὲν refers back to τοὺς πλείονας of *v.*[14], but by both the flow of argument in the main paragraph is interrupted by the introduction of new material: there is a section of the Church, it is interjected, which, in its jealousy and self-seeking, is working against Paul; whereas the argument of *vv.*[12-14], that Paul's imprisonment, far from being a hindrance, has issued in the advancement of the gospel, so that a majority of the Church members have gained increasing boldness to preach the Word, is taken up again in *vv.*[18.19], where Paul rejoices to hear that the Word is preached, and affirms that, under God, events will turn out for good. If, therefore, we take *vv.*[15-17] as elaborating this theme by giving the content and objective of the preaching as well as referring to the events, we do less violence to the argument as a whole.

Moreover both traditional interpretations give rise to difficulties and inconsistencies and strain the language. Take (B) first. τινὲς μὲν are distinct from τοὺς πλέονας. Who, then, are they? The suggestion that they are Judaizers is met with the assertion that 'Nowhere are Judaizers preachers of Christ . . . (2 Co xi. 4)' (M. R. Vincent, *Philippians and Colossians*, in *ICC*). Vincent quotes Weiss: 'The way in which Paul unreservedly gives expression to his joy respecting this accession of preaching, makes it quite inconceivable that these personal opponents should have preached a gospel in any way different from that which he preached' so draws the conclusion that it was jealousy of Paul which led them on. But (A) meets with similar difficulties and inner contradictions. How, it may be asked, could a party 'waxing confident by my bonds' . . . 'preach Christ.' . . . 'To add gall to my bonds' in contrast to others similarly inspired, and preaching 'knowing that I am set for the defence of the gospel'?

The foregoing translation of θλίψιν ἐγείρειν τοῖς δεσμοῖς μου illustrates the strain which the traditional interpretations throw on the language. The vocabulary of the passage has links with social ethics rather than religious controversy and partisanship: φθόνος and ἔρις appear together in Ro 1[29] and 1 T 6[4] as anti-social vices, and Cremer thus defines ἐριθέια: 'Since Aristotle, used in a bad sense of those who seek only their own in the State; selfishness, self-willedness.' Nor does ἐνδοκία easily take the meaning of 'good will' of man to man as used in the interpretation of this passage in describing the relation of one Church party to Paul, for the primary meaning in the LXX and Sirach is the favour of God to man, secondarily of man's 'willingness' or 'freedom of resolve.'

We can, then, more easily take the civil authorities as the objects of the preaching of the two groups and the difference of their subject-matter is not hard to understand for those who have preached in an environment hostile to Christianity. Two answers can be given to oppressive action of the authorities: the resentful, self-righteous preaching of vengeance to come and the more difficult and not necessarily less steadfast proclamation of the God who controls all history, who can turn the bonds of a Paul to the furtherance of the gospel, calling all men back to Himself. Such ideas come naturally out of *vv.*[15.16], but it will be asked how *v.*[17] fits. 'To raise up persecution by (or, for) my bonds' —self-immolating martyrdom does not seem at first sight a likely addition to the preaching of a group warning non-Christians of future retribution. But a completely hostile environment encourages apocalyptic hopes, and we may think of this group as taking too literally the encouragement of Ac 14[22] 'that we must through much tribulation enter into the kingdom of God.' They would then have views similar to those elaborated in the 'Little Apocalypse' of Mk 13 (*v.*[19]): 'For in those days shall be affliction (θλῖψις)' . . . (*v.*[24]) 'after the tribulation' . . . (*v.*[26]) '. . . shall they see the Son of man coming in the clouds in great power and glory. . . .' Such was their boldness (wrong-headed, as it seemed to Paul) that they were willing to accept the grievous consequences of their preaching in the expectation of the imminent coming of their Lord.

The whole passage, then, would run: (*v.*[14]) . . . to speak the word without fear. (*v.*[15]) Some indeed preach Christ even of ill-will and contention and some also of disinterested good will: (*v.*[16]) the one preach Christ of love, understanding that I am posted for the defence of the gospel, (*v.*[17]) the other narrowly and with mixed motives, intending to raise up persecution by my bonds. (*v.*[18]) What then? notwithstanding, every way, whether for the right or the wrong reasons, Christ is preached; and I therein do rejoice. . . .

If this interpretation is acceptable, it may point to a late date and the composition of the letter in Rome, for the doctrine of providence held by one party is advanced and the apocalyptic views of the other has its counterpart in Mark's Gospel, but it can be maintained independently of such conclusions.

T. HAWTHORN

Lately of
Hua Chung University,
Wuchang, C. China

Recent Foreign Theology

Anthropomorphism in the Old Testament. A new issue in the series *Bibliothèque Théologique* deals with the subject of anthropomorphism in the Old Testament, under the title *God in the image of Man*, and comes from the pen of F. Michaeli.[1] In it the author first makes a careful study of all the anthropomorphic expressions used in the Bible—bodily attributes and actions, emotions, residence, and theophanies—and then the modifications in the later texts and versions, whereby some of the cruder expressions were modified, but without doing away altogether with anthropomorphism. Indeed, even to-day we do not dispense with anthropomorphism altogether, but continue to speak of the hand and eye and heart of God. In the final section of the book, which is the most important, the author estimates the religious significance of anthropomorphism, shows that it preserves the personal character of God instead of making Him a pale abstraction, and is essential to the conception of a God who reveals Himself and who is active in His world, and is vital to the belief in a God who calls men into His fellowship for the reflection of His image in their lives. In the final chapter the significance of anthropomorphism as the basis for the doctrine of the Incarnation is underlined, though the author declines to read the Incarnation back into the Old Testament in the way some have done—as, for instance, in the equation of Jacob's antagonist at Peniel with Jesus Christ. The whole forms a sober and valuable study.

The Early Traditions of Israel. It is nine years since the last Beiheft of the *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenshcaft* appeared. Now this familiar series has begun again to appear, its first post-war issue being a one hundred page review of C. A. Simpson's *The Early Traditions of Israel* by Professor Otto Eissfeldt.[2] The exposition of the positions adopted by Simpson is clear—clearer, indeed, than many readers have found Simpson's own work—and the analytical tables which Eissfeldt has prepared will be of value to every reader of Simpson's book, and might with advantage have appeared in the original work. Equally valuable are Eissfeldt's comparisons of Simpson's analysis with those of other scholars, and the critical examination of his views. At no time have more discordant voices been heard on questions of Pentateuchal criticism than to-day, and the variety of solutions offered is considerable. Many scholars who still give a general adhesion to the Graf-Wellhausen view are doubtful of the possibility of such a minute and detailed analysis as Simpson offers. Here, however, the reader will find a critical review of his book by one who begins with a large measure of sympathy, since he is himself the author of a well-known and important analysis, published nearly thirty years ago.[3] Few books deserve, and fewer receive, such detailed and elaborate reviews as this.

Moravian Theology in Swedish Form. The Swedish scholar, G. Hök, whose study of Zinzendorf's views [4] was noticed in these columns earlier, has now published a Swedish work on the ideas of the Swedish Moravian, Arvid Gradin, to which is appended a German summary.[5] The study is based on a work written in 1742, and the author carefully exposes the views of the Swedish pietist and then offers some comparison of his views with those of Zinzendorf, showing that despite a general similarity, there are important differences between them. Especially is this so in connexion with the relation of Law and Gospel, where Gradin holds that the Law was abolished with the death of Christ, whereas Zinzendorf held that it still remained. Further, whereas Zinzendorf held that God often influenced men directly without the mediation of the Bible, Gradin held that mediation to be invariable. He is shown to have presented a combination of the extreme anti-intellectualism of Zinzendorf and of intellectualism. The question is then considered whether Gradin owed anything to the contemporary Wolffianism, and a table is appended to show to what extent he combined the views of this school and of Zinzendorf.

Old Testament Theology. Of the growing interest in the theology of the Old Testament, which was so long neglected, there is ample evidence. The neglect was in part due to a feeling that in the Old Testament we had the record of a long process of growth, and that it could not be treated as a unity. Now, however, there is the recognition

[1] *Dieu à l'image de l'homme*, 1950. (Delachaux et Niestlé, Neuchatel and Paris. Price : Swiss fr. 6.50.)

[2] *Die ältesten Traditionen Israels : ein kritischer Bericht über C. A. Simpson's The Early Traditions of Israel*, 1950. (Töpelmann, Berlin.)

[3] *Hexateuch-Synopse*, 1922.

[4] *Zinzendorfs Begriff der Religion*, 1948.

[5] *Herrnhutisk teologi i Svensk gestalt : Arvid Gradins dogmatiska och etiska huvudtankar* (Uppsala Universitetets Årsskrift, 1949 : 8), 1950. (Lundequistska, Uppsala and Harrassowitz, Leipzig. Kr. 8.50.) The present note is based on the German summary only, since this is all that was sent to the Editor.

that through the growth there was a dynamic unity, which can be expressed in a theology, provided that a historical sense is preserved and the result not presented in static terms. The latest scholar to address himself to the task of writing such a theology of the Old Testament is Th. C. Vriezen, whose work is written in Dutch.[1] Unlike Eichrodt, he does not view all primarily in terms of a single idea, and unlike Vischer, he does not read the New Testament back into the Old. This does not mean, however, that he treats the Old Testament without reference to the New. He finds in it the record of a historical movement which found its culmination and fulfilment in Christ, so that the difference between the Testaments, as well as the bond uniting them, can be recognized.

The main body of the work treats its subject under the headings God, Man, the Intercourse between God and Man, the Intercourse between Man and Man, and the relations between God, Man, and the World. The whole is treated not merely with competence, but with penetration, and in view of our lack of any good modern work in English on this subject, it would be a boon if we could have Vriezen's work translated into English.

H. H. Rowley
Manchester University.

[1] *Hoofdlijnen der Theologie van het Oude Testament* [1949]. Veenman en Zonen, Wageningen.

Entre Nous

Ave Atque Vale

Bishop Walter Carey's autobiography—*Good-Bye to My Generation* (Mowbray : 10s. 6d. net)—is a very attractive and inspiring volume. And no wonder ; for he has known many famous people and had a part in many not unimportant events. ' I have seen Kruger presiding over the Volksraad in Pretoria in 1896 ; I have heard Liddon preach ; I was in the *Warspite* in the Battle of Jutland ; I knew Dolling and Stanton and Gore and Scott Holland well ; and I have played in two unbeaten rugby sides—at school and for Oxford University—and you can assess these as you like in relative importance, but to me at least they are interesting.' And to us too, more especially as the Bishop is an intensely live personality, and one gets the impression that he will be very much alive for a long time. He was only seventy-five last year, has been a Bishop for thirty years (of Bloemfontein) and a priest for fifty. We can hardly imagine that he is in earnest when he quotes Calverley's words as possibly describing himself : ' He's imbecile, but lingers yet.' I have a strong impression that when he pictures his own old age as ' slowing gracefully down to the terminus ' he sees the buffers a long way off.

It is not given to every man, still less to every Bishop, to combine under his own hat three different schools of thought, but that is what Bishop Carey succeeds in doing. He is intensely evangelical, confessing his own devotion to Christ very simply and touchingly. He is, I think, a high churchman (his friends were Talbot, Gore, Scott Holland, Dolling, and, *mirabile dictu*, Darwell Stone—I can hardly imagine any one less like Carey than Stone). But he is also in a real sense a broad churchman. No one could more sincerely put everything out of count beside faith in the Saviour (' I was really more interested in Christ and real Christianity than I was in sectarian divisions. I hardly knew it, but I was panting for something bigger and wider').

He had an enjoying nature (' I've enjoyed meeting people, playing games, seeing things and places, going through experiences ') and he tells us about these things. And others will enjoy them too, for he is so ' hearty ' and friendly—a sort of ' God bless you ' kind of man. But in his book there are also several serious matters discussed. He says a good deal about the South African problem. He thinks ' apartheid ' is not practicable, and pleads for equity to the native. And he makes one suggestive remark. He thinks Malan and Hertzog have never got over the Boer War. Botha and Smuts did completely get over it. They were really big men but their successors have not their stature.

The most interesting pages in this charming book, however, are concerned with two things—one, what may be called a philosophical theory to which Bishop Carey clings almost passionately, and the other, with the Bishop's views on the claims of Anglicanism and Romanism. The theory I refer to is that the basis of all true religion is the ' Law Natural,' that is that everybody except a pervert instinctively knows that he ought to be good. I think this is a product of his characteristic optimism. It may be true. At any rate, the Bishop bases everything on it.

The other serious matter is the ground of his

churchmanship. He is a fervent Anglican, believing quite firmly that the Church of England constitution, of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, is to be found in Scripture. He deals with this matter at great length, and in the course of the discussion comes up against Rome on the one part and Geneva on the other. As a fervent and convinced Protestant I was deeply interested in his handling of the Roman claims, and I may add that nowhere in a limited space do I know of any discussion of them so thorough and persuasive. His treatment of non-episcopal churches is sympathetic and kindly, but he remains an impenitent Anglican in the full sense. It would be out of question for me to argue the point here. It will be enough to say that the pages in which his church standing is expounded are full of interest and will be read with equal sympathy and kindness, by, let us say, equally impenitent Presbyterians. In any case, whether the book is concerned with simple, human interests or with profound and searching problems, it is pleasant to spend a spare hour or two in such refreshing and rewarding company.

F. J. Rae

The Gospel in Hymns

The Gospel in Hymns, by Mr. Albert Edward Bailey (Scribners'; $6.00), is a very comprehensive work. It traces the history of the writing of hymns in general and it gives a detailed account of the origin of some three hundred and forty-nine hymns. The basis on which it is written is that 'few hymns were written in a vacuum' and that all hymns will be sung with greater profit if the circumstances of their writing is known. The method of arrangement is historical and there are nineteen chapters, dealing with each of the historical periods of hymn writing.

This is a book which is packed with information. One of the extraordinary features of hymn production is the number of hymns the great hymn writers wrote. Watts wrote seven hundred and sixty-one; Newton two hundred and eighty-one; Horatius Bonar six hundred, of which forty-one are used in Roman Catholic churches; and Charles Wesley the incredible number of six thousand five hundred. Richard Baxter loved the hymns and poems of George Herbert. 'Herbert speaks to God like one that really believeth in a God, and whose business in the world is most with God.' John Milton wrote 'Let us with a gladsome mind,' at the age of fifteen. The Latin inscription above the Master's throne in Winchester College may be freely translated, 'Learn, leave or be licked.' The two great hymns 'Awake, my soul, and with the sun' and 'Glory to Thee, my God, this night' were written by Ken as morning and evening hymns for the boys of Winchester College. It was Charles the Second who said of Ken 'little Ken tells me of my faults.' When Charles visited Winchester it was proposed to lodge Nell Gwyn with Ken but Ken flatly refused, but when the appointment to the see of Bath and Wells fell vacant Charles said: 'Odd's fish! Who shall have Bath and Wells but little Ken who would not give poor Nelly a lodging.' Charles could admire a man of principle.

There is a half-amusing, half-tragic account of a slanging match between Toplady and John Wesley. Toplady said of Wesley: 'I believe him to be the most rancorous hater of the gospel-system that ever appeared in this island,' 'Wesley is guilty of Satanic shamelessness,' of 'acting the ignoble part of a lurking, sly assassin,' or 'uniting the sophistry of a Jesuit with the authority of a pope.' Wesley said of Toplady: 'I dare not speak of the deep things of God in the spirit of a prize-fighter or a stage-player,' and on another occasion: 'I do not fight with chimney sweeps.'

Baring-Gould wrote 'Onward Christian soldiers' as a marching song for the children as they marched to a Whit Monday school festival in a neighbouring village, and he wrote it in fifteen minutes. Oliver Wendell Holmes, the Unitarian, introduced 'Lord of all being throned afar' with the words, 'Forget for a moment the differences in the hues of truth we look at through our human prisms, and join in singing (inwardly) this hymn to the Source of the light we shall all need to lead us and the warmth which alone can make us brothers.'

This book is magnificently printed, indexed and illustrated. It is crammed with information that would enrich any church service.

William Barclay

A Disquieting Appreciation

The Congregational Quarterly for April quotes a disconcerting sentence from the farewell of a young German doctor, once a Nazi warrior, now a Christian, on the eve of leaving this country after a short visit. 'The young people in your churches have everywhere received me with kindness and courtesy, but I am concerned about the casual quality of their faith; they do not give to Christ anything like the devotion we once gave to Hitler. They do not see the urgency of the situation.'

Printed in Scotland by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.